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1NC—T Development

1. Interpretation: Development refers to programs funded by the NASA or DOD development budgets

GAO ’10 (Government Accounting Office, “United States Government Stewardship Information (Unaudited) for the Years Ended September 30, 2010, 2009,” http://www.gao.gov/financial/fy2010/10stew.pdf)

With regard to development, the DOD and NASA had $65.3 billion (84 percent) and $9.1 billion (12 percent), respectively, of total development investments in fiscal year 2010, as shown in Table 11. Development is comprised of five stages: advanced technology development, advanced component development and prototypes, system development and demonstration, management support, and operational systems development. Major outputs of DOD development are: • Hardware and software components, and complete weapon systems ready for operational and developmental testing and field use, and • Weapon systems finalized for complete operational and developmental testing. NASA development programs include activities to extend our knowledge of Earth, its space environment, and the universe, and to invest in new aeronautics and advanced space transportation technologies that support the development and application of technologies critical to the economic, scientific, and technical competiveness of the United States. Some outcomes and future outcomes of this development are: • The Earth Science Research Program improves the capability to document the global distribution of a range of important environmental parameters related to the Earth’s atmosphere, hydrosphere, biosphere, cryosphere, and land surface; to understand the processes that drive and connect them; and to improve our capability to predict the future evolution of the Earth system, including climate, weather, and natural hazards. • Earth Systematic Missions provide Earth observing satellites that contribute to the provision of long-term environmental data sets that can be used to study the evolution of the Earth system on a range of temporal scales. This information is used to analyze, model, and improve understanding of the Earth system. • The Mars Exploration program has been developed to conduct a rigorous, incremental, discovery-driven exploration of Mars to determine the planet’s physical, dynamic, and geological characteristics, investigate the Martian climate in the context of understanding habitability, and investigate whether Mars ever had the potential to develop and harbor any kind of life. • The Cosmic Origins missions explore how the expanding universe grew into a grand, cosmic web of galaxies; how stars and planets formed within the galaxies; how stars created the heavy elements, such as carbon, that are essential for life. Major breakthroughs in our knowledge of the cosmos have already been made with the current suite of missions.

And substantial refers to having material substance

TheAmerican heritagedictionary, bartleby.com/61/, 2000.

1. Of, relating to, or having substance; material. 2. True or real; not imaginary. 3. Solidly built; strong. 4. Ample; sustaining: a substantial breakfast. 5. Considerable in importance, value, degree, amount, or extent: won by a substantial margin. 6. Possessing wealth or property; well-to-do.

1. Violation: Ratifying a treaty doesn’t increase the budget for material development
2. Standards:
3. Ground division: key to generics like politics and spending that link off budget changes—reading their aff as a CP solves their education claims
4. Limits: moots substantial: makes it impossible for the neg to predict aff cases and encourages increasingly small aff plans
5. Effectually topical: even if the plan allows for future development that doesn’t precisely affirm the topic. This is an independent voter because it’s unpredictable and disrupts fair division ground.
6. Voting issue for fairness and education

2NC—AT: Counter-Interpretation

**You have it backwards—banning weaponization is detrimental to development. At worst you make the topic bidirectional which kills predictable limits**

McKnight ’03 (John Carter, “Let's Weaponize Space”) http://www.spacedaily.com/news/oped-03d.html

Efforts to ban space-based weaponry, by international treaty and American legislation, are directly harmful to space development. Practical, effective means of defending space-based assets can ensure the growth of infrastructure and enable the establishment of human settlements in space. Space advocates should join in opposing overbroad efforts to prevent space weaponization. Shortly, U.S. Congressional Representative Dennis Kucinich (Democrat, Cleveland, Ohio,) will re-introduce his "Space Preservation Act," calling on the President to work towards enacting a proposed international treaty to ban space-based weapons, the Space Preservation Treaty. The act, previously introduced in 2002 (H.R. 3616) and 2001 (H.R. 2977), stands little chance of passage. Nonetheless, the measure should be opposed now, to disrupt the formation of any international consensus to enact a treaty over the opposition of the spacefaring powers. Space-based assets are already essential to our networked civilization. GPS-dependent ranchers in Canada and sailors in the Atlantic, cell-phone users in Bangkok and Tel Aviv, field medics and polar explorers, all owe their livelihoods, if not their lives, to space infrastructure. Space lines of communication are as essential to 21st Century global commerce as sea lines of communication were in previous eras. Those lines must be defended.

AT: HAARP (No ozone impact)

The HAARP has zero effect on the ozone layer—natural processes like auroras are hundreds of thousands of times more damaging

Eccles and Armstrong ’93 (V. Eccles and R. Armstrong, “UPPER ATMOSPHERIC EFFECTS OF THE HF ACTIVE AURORAL RESEARCH PROGRAM IONISPHERIC RESEARCH INSTRUMENT (HAARP IRI),” Mission Research Corporation, May 1993, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA268948&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf)

The ozone layer, which protects life on earth from ultraviolet rays, is contained primarily between 10 and 30 miles altitude. The amount of ozone, 03, present in the stratosphere is a result of a balance of processes that produce ozone and processes that destroy ozone. This region of the atmosphere is called the stratosphere. Experiments have shown that natural processes, such as auroras, produce molecules that destroy ozone. One family of these molecules is called odd nitrogen. Nitric oxide (NO) belongs to this family. Because the HAARP (HF Active Auroral Research Program) facility is designed to mimic and investigate certain natural processes, a study of the possible effects of HAARP on the ozone layer was conducted. The study used a detailed model of the thermal and chemical effects of the HF radar beam. The HAARP facility heats the free electrons in the upper atmosphere above 50 miles altitude. Most of the heating will produce airglow and winds. Airglow is light emitted by excited air molecules. Only a small fraction of the beam energy goes to producing odd nitrogen molecules. The total energy emitted by HAARP in a year is 200,000 times less than the energy deposited in the upper atmosphere by auroras. Odd nitrogen is efficiently produced by auroras in contrast to production from processes induced by the HF beam. The comparison of the HAARP effects to natural processes in the upper atmosphere demonstrate that HAARP HF beam experiments will have no measurable depletion effects on the earth's ozone layer.

AT: HAARP (Not real)

The HAARP is not a mind or weather control device and it will not destroy the ozone. Also your authors are idiots.

Brian Dunning, “HAARP Myths.” Skeptoid Media, 7 October 2008, <http://skeptoid.com/episodes/4122>

Let's talk about the claims made about HAARP, but first let's talk about what it actually is and what exactly it's really capable of. First of all, there's nothing remotely secret or even classified about HAARP. No security clearance is needed to visit and tour the site, and HAARP usually holds an open house every summer during which anyone can see everything there. During the rest of the year, research is conducted. The universities that have participated in HAARP research include University of Alaska, Stanford, Penn State, Boston College, Dartmouth, Cornell, University of Maryland, University of Massachusetts, MIT, Polytechnic University, UCLA, Clemson and the University of Tulsa. There are several other similar research stations around the world, namely the Sura facility in Russia, EISCAT in Norway, the Arecibo observatory in Puerto Rico, and the HIPAS observatory near Fairbanks, operated by UCLA. If you look at HAARP on Google Earth, you can see there's not much there, and the current view shows only four cars in the small parking lot. HAARP consists of an observatory and an adjacent 28-acre field with 180 HF (high frequency) antennas, each 72 feet tall, with a maximum transmission power of 3600 kilowatts, about 75 times the power of a commercial radio station, but only a tiny fraction of the strength of the natural solar radiation striking the same part of the ionosphere at which HAARP is aimed. Although the observatory operates continuously, the HF antenna array is activated only rarely for specific experiments, which average about once a month. Sadly for the conspiracy theorists, HAARP has no potential to affect weather. The frequency of energy that HAARP transmits cannot be absorbed by the troposphere or the stratosphere, only by the ionosphere, many kilometers higher than the highest atmospheric weather systems. The ionosphere is created and replenished daily by solar radiation. At night, the level of ionization drops quickly to very low levels at lower altitudes of 50 to 100 miles, but at higher altitudes over 200 miles it takes most of the night for the ionization to disperse. During the night, when the natural ionosphere is minimal, HAARP is capable of creating a weak artificial aurora that can actually be observed by sensitive cameras at the observatory, though they are far too faint for the naked eye. During the daytime, solar radiation ionizes the ionosphere so powerfully that HAARP's weak artificial effects are the proverbial drop in the bucket, and are erased almost immediately when the transmitter is turned off. You might ask "What's the point of HAARP?" If it's not to wreak global destruction, what good is it? Communication and navigation signals are sent through the atmosphere for a broad range of civilian and military purposes. Guided missiles rely on digital transmissions which can be affected or jammed by a whole variety of natural and artificial causes. Global Positioning System and encrypted communications all need to be able to make it to their recipients in wartime, regardless of the atmospheric and electromagnetic conditions. The study of these effects is the primary reason that DARPA, the U.S. Air Force, and the U.S. Navy contribute to HAARP's funding. In addition, by bouncing signals off the ionosphere at at altitude of 100km, HAARP has been able to create Extremely Low Frequency, or ELF, waves as low as 1 Hertz, which can potentially be used for worldwide communication including reaching submarines, though at an almost uselessly slow data rate. But before you conclude that these ELF waves might be used for creating earthquakes, note that the maximum ELF signal amplitude produced by HAARP has been measured at less than one ten-millionth of the Earth's natural background field. So if HAARP is so anticlimactically mundane, why all the conspiracy theories? HAARP is operated by MarshCreek, LLC, an Alaska Native Corporation under contract to the Office of Naval Research. Anytime the ONR or DARPA or the military have their hand in something, paranoid types tend to come out of the woodwork and blame anything they can imagine on it. So regardless of whether HAARP is in the atmospheric research business or the rubber duckie business, they were pretty much doomed to conspiracy charges from the beginning. But there is also a secondary reason that HAARP has been suspected of deeper, darker purposes, and it goes back to its early construction. The winning contractor to build HAARP was ARCO Power Technologies, or APTI. ARCO has historically been one of Alaska's largest employers and they initially set up APTI as a subsidiary to construct power plants using Alaska's vast natural gas reserves. One scientist employed at APTI was Dr. Bernard Eastlund, a physicist of some note. Among Dr. Eastlund's accomplishments was the co-invention of the fusion torch, and the original owner of a 1985 U.S. patent on a "Method and apparatus for altering a region in the earth's atmosphere, ionosphere, and/or magnetosphere." Dr. Eastlund's method required a location near the poles, where the lines of the Earth's magnetic field are more or less perpendicular to the surface, like Alaska, and presumed a natural gas power source. A few years later, the HAARP program began. A coincidence? No way, say the conspiracy theorists. It seems logical to me that if I were ARCO and wanted to get in on a lucrative government construction contract and sell them my Alaskan natural gas, I might well set up a subsidiary with one of the world's leading experts in the field. To me this looks like a smart business move by ARCO and by the government; how it would suggest an evil conspiracy to destroy the world, I'm just not seeing that. Dr. Eastlund's patent, which has since become popularly known (though inaccurately) as the "HAARP patent", is widely reproduced online, often with much commentary from authors making their own interpretations of how it might be used. Specifically, the patent involves using natural gas to generate electricity to create electromagnetic radiation to excite a tiny section of the ionosphere to about 2 electron volts, thus moving it upward along the lines of the magnetic field. The conspiracy theorists, once again, completely ignore the fact that this can only happen in the ionosphere, and they interpret it as a weather control system or earthquake generating system. Such extrapolations are without any plausible foundation. A further disconnect in this conspiracy claim is that Dr. Eastlund's patent was for a speculative and unproven device approximately one million times as powerful as HAARP. The patent does not mention HAARP, and none of its drawings remotely resemble anything built at HAARP. For perspective, HAARP's antenna array measures about 1000 feet on a side. A device such as that imagined by Dr. Eastlund would have been 14 miles on a side, with one million antenna elements, compared to HAARP's 180. Furthermore, Dr. Eastlund left APTI to found his own company before the HAARP program began, and was never associated with the program. One of the most vocal critics of HAARP is Nick Begich, son of the late Alaskan congressman of the same name. He writes as Dr. Nick Begich, but his Ph.D. is in traditional medicine and was purchased via mail from the unaccredited Open International University in India, and included no coursework or curriculum. Begich is a proponent of a number of new age energy healing techniques of his own invention. In 1995 he self-published Angels Don't Play This HAARP. This book kick-started many of the popular rumors about HAARP, including that mass mind control is one of its goals. A conspiracy theorist named Benjamin Fulford has made some YouTube videos charging that HAARP is responsible for most of the severe earthquakes around the world, and that the United States threatens nations like Japan with earthquakes if they don't "do what we want". He believes that HAARP accomplishes this by heating up water in the atmosphere the same way that a microwave oven does, though he is not clear on how warming a tiny patch of upper atmosphere in Alaska would cause an earthquake in Asia with pinpoint precision. There is no known correlation between temperature and earthquakes. Fulford's microwave theory is also wide of the mark. HAARP's maximum frequency is 10 MHz, and the dielectric heating effect of a microwave oven requires 2.5 GHz, or 250 times higher than HAARP. Dielectric heating also requires reversing the polarity of the field more than a million times a second, one thousand times HAARP's fastest frequency. A note to conspiracy theorists: At least pretend to know what you're talking about.

HAARP Good: Hegemony (1/2)

Electronic warfare is critical to maintain stable forward deployment in Asia which is key to hegemony—signal manipulation through tech like the HAARP disrupts Chinese surveillance technology and anti-sub and anti-carrier missiles

Soloman 4-15 (Jonathan F. Solomon, “DEFENDING THE FLEET FROM CHINA’s ANTI-SHIP BALLISTIC MISSILE: NAVAL DECEPTION’S ROLES IN SEA-BASED MISSILE DEFENSE,” thesis submitted for fulfillment of Master of Arts in Security Studies at Georgetown University, 15 April 2011, http://gradworks.umi.com/1491548.pdf\*\*\*ASBM = anti-ship ballistic missile. COSS = Chinese Ocean Surveillance System.)

U.S. conventional deterrence against Chinese aggression appears geared towards a strategy of denial. As observed throughout this paper, the U.S. relies heavily upon naval use of the Western Pacific to blunt notional PLA offensives in East Asia. Strategic airlift can move U.S. forces and supplies into the region swiftly, but not necessarily in the amounts required to arrest a notional fast-moving PLA campaign for a limited political objective.236 Long-range conventional strikes as well as submarine warfare can severely damage PLA forces and/or China’s military-economic potential, but they may not be able to compel the PLA’s retreat from any First Island Chain territories captured in a Chinese offensive on their own. Nor would they be able to reassert control over regional sea lanes on their own.237 Naval surface forces play a major role in the U.S. East Asian conventional deterrent by virtue of their unique and historically-demonstrated abilities to assert a visible peacetime presence, exercise sea control, and insert and sustain large-scale ground forces.238 It follows that COSS and the ASBM are intended to upend the combat effectiveness of these maritime components of America’s East Asian conventional deterrent, and in turn weaken the political credibility of America’s overall East Asian deterrence by denial strategy. U.S. leaders might respond to China’s theater military strategy by reassigning some share of aircraft carriers’ East Asian contingency sea denial and long-range land-attack missions to submarines and long-range aerospace forces. They might opt to go further by prioritizing procurement of new submarines and long-range manned and/or unmanned strike aircraft over procurement of new carriers and shorter-ranged manned aircraft such as the Joint Strike Fighter. Although these measures might make U.S. Navy forward deployed firepower more survivable during the first days or weeks of a notional East Asian war, they would not be able to completely cover all of the war’s probable maritime combat tasks. Just about any conceivable East Asian contingency might require carrier strike group, amphibious ready group, surface combatant action group, maritime BMD group, and/or convoy escort group operations within ASBM range as a notional crisis peaked. Each of these surface group types would also inevitably have to operate within ASBM range as a notional war unfolded.239 Some but not all U.S. Navy Western Pacific surface operations could theoretically be delayed until the U.S. theater-level commander judged that COSS capabilities had been adequately eroded. The amount of time that any particular surface operation could be delayed would be affected by highly dynamic, interlinked, and unpredictable operational, strategic, and political pressures. Chief among these pressures is the likelihood that a U.S. decision to temporarily hold back or withdraw major surface forces from the ASBM coverage zone as regional tensions rose without prior political and military coordination with allied leaders would be interpreted as a signal of weakened U.S. commitment to defensive treaty obligations. This perception would stick no matter how much U.S. diplomats and political leaders strived to reassure otherwise. It might also misinform Chinese leaders’ political and military-operational estimates regarding a desired PLA offensive’s probability of success.240 The bottom line is that neither submarines nor long-range land and sea-based strike capabilities would allow the U.S. to indefinitely delay let alone completely avoid surface forces’ exposure to the ASBM threat during notional Western Pacific combat operations. The alternative to risking surface forces would be to scale back what the U.S. aimed to achieve in a notional conflict, which in turn would risk eroding American grand strategic credibility along with allies’ and partners’ resolve. Needless to say, this would also increase the risk that the conflict’s political settlement might end up being unfavorable as well as embarrassing to American interests and prestige. The necessity of investing in anti-ASBM active defense, EW, and tactical deception capabilities is therefore derived more from strategic choices than from the Fleet’s actual force structure. ASBM defense systems’ procurement quantities would likely be affected on the margins if Fleet force structure varied, but the need to procure these systems in sizable quantities would not. If anything, a force of fewer carriers would make those remaining even more valuable and would increase—not decrease—the need to robustly defend them. The number of large surface combatants assigned to protect carriers during major combat operations might actually be increased under these circumstances. The need to protect surface forces such as BMD-capable combatants, amphibious warships, and supply/maritime prepositioning ships would also remain unchanged, as these ships’ roles cannot be duplicated by submarines, long-range strike systems, or strategic airlift.

<card continues>

HAARP Good: Hegemony (2/2)

<card continues>

While there is no such thing as an impenetrable, ‘perfect’ defense, these battleforce defensive measures do have two simultaneous and complementary effects. First, they increase the amount of military power—and by extension diplomatic and economic power—a near-peer aggressor must expend to achieve his political objectives. Second and perhaps more importantly, they can increase the aggressor’s uncertainty regarding whether or not his desired adventure can be accomplished at an acceptable political and material cost. The longer it takes to reduce the defender’s offensive and defensive combat potential, the more time the defender has to use all forms of strategic national or alliance power to keep the aggressor from attaining his political objectives and perhaps even rally to defeat him outright. As shown throughout this paper, EW systems and deceptive tactics complicate an attacker’s maritime strike planning by increasing the number of non-readily quantifiable variables that his strikes must overcome in order to succeed. EW combines with active defenses to increase the overall effectiveness of battleforce defense, thereby forcing an attacker to increase his salvos’ sizes in order to increase his probability of neutralizing targeted warships. Used effectively, tactical deception can also delay the attacker’s strikes long enough for naval battleforces to achieve their missions or otherwise disorient the attacker to the point that he completely hesitates to strike. Particularly skillful tactical deception might even be able to lure the attacker into wasting some of his missile inventory against ‘phantom’ warships or battleforces. Furthermore, it seems highly likely that the attacker’s ocean surveillance and reconnaissance-strike systems’ combat potential will degrade rapidly following an outbreak of hostilities. This means that if the defender’s forward deployed warships obtain a higher chance of surviving the first few salvoes, the defender will be better able to restore a high degree of naval combat potential in theater when the survivors merge with reinforcement battleforces and the time comes to reclaim the operational-strategic initiative. It follows that large inventories of shipboard BMD interceptors are necessary to hedge against the risk that the defender’s kinetic and non-kinetic erosion of the attacker’s ocean surveillance and reconnaissance-strike systems proves ineffective or insufficient.

Heg is good—prevents global war

Zalmay Khalilzad, former US ambassador to the UN and Iraq, still writing the best cards in debate, “The Economy and National Security,” National Review, 8 February 2011, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=1>

American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

HAARP Good: East Asian Influence (1/2)

Chinese ASBMs and surveillance threatens long-term US naval deployment in East Asia—only demonstrating disruptive capabilities through electronic warfare provides a stable counterbalance to check Chinese aggression and dissuasion

Soloman 4-15 (Jonathan F. Solomon, “DEFENDING THE FLEET FROM CHINA’s ANTI-SHIP BALLISTIC MISSILE: NAVAL DECEPTION’S ROLES IN SEA-BASED MISSILE DEFENSE,” thesis submitted for fulfillment of Master of Arts in Security Studies at Georgetown University, 15 April 2011, http://gradworks.umi.com/1491548.pdf\*\*\*ASBM = anti-ship ballistic missile. COSS = Chinese Ocean Surveillance System.)

All of these defensive elements and considerations provide for a far more robust denial capability. If this is effectively communicated to a would-be aggressor, it might affect his confidence in his ability to win quickly, cheaply, and decisively. Deterrence is, after all, mostly a political question: military considerations and perceptions serve as inputs to the political calculus. As a former Chinese missile designer recently put it, ASBMs serve as “political chips” regardless of how they might perform in combat because of the sense of threat they impose.241 A near-term overt DF-21D demonstration against a moving target at sea would likely increase the political-level sense of threat and intimidation regardless of whether or not such a ‘test’ appeared rigged to experts.242 While Chinese sources might claim that the ASBM serves as the PLA’s own tool for conventional deterrence by denial, it can just as easily be used as a coercive tool similar to the role played by the PLA’s land-attack Short Range Ballistic Missile (SRBM) forces deployed opposite Taiwan. PLA peacetime coercion using its ballistic missile arsenal is in fact consistent with Chinese deterrence theory. Whereas deterrence theory in the West centers on dissuading an adversary from taking a proscribed action, Chinese deterrence theory blends dissuasion as well as compellence of an adversary. This theory, also known as weishe zhanlue, embraces Sun Tsu’s classical maxim on the benefits of ‘winning without fighting’ by means of military posturing and provocative capability demonstrations. Modern Chinese strategy has often embraced maintenance of crisis conditions, manipulation of tensions, and general brinksmanship as a means of achieving political objectives short of war. It is thus intriguing that Chinese leaders’ declaratory deterrence statements and policies during several major regional crises over the past half century have not explicitly identified the actions or behaviors that they wish to deter their adversaries from taking. Chinese deterrence statements prior to the PLA’s offensives against U.N. Forces on the Korean Peninsula in fall 1950, India in fall 1962, and Vietnam in winter 1979 seemed geared more towards preserving options for offensive strategic military surprise rather than articulating proscribed actions. There is some evidence in each of these three crises that CCP leaders were leaning towards or had already decided on taking offensive compellent action as their adversaries’ conventional forces were either inadequately postured or numerically insufficient for credibly deterring Chinese offensive action. Outside of a ‘desperation’ scenario, there does not appear to be any historical evidence that CCP leaders would order a PLA offensive if they did not believe they had a high probability of achieving their political objectives.243 The best way to counteract ASBM-related political effects and reinforce America’s East Asian extended conventional deterrence credibility is therefore to induce Chinese leadership perceptions that U.S. surface forces have low susceptibility to COSS and the ASBM, that an operationally-relevant portion of forward deployed U.S. surface forces in the Western Pacific would likely survive any surprise first ASBM salvo, that this means U.S. surface forces cannot be quickly or cheaply prevented at standoff distances from fulfilling their roles in blocking and then reversing Chinese aggression in East Asia, and that U.S. political leaders are resolved not to settle for any outcome of a Chinese-initiated conflict other than restoration of the status quo ante. This would need to be done while simultaneously instilling a sense of confidence and reassurance in allied and partner countries’ leaders’ minds. Periodic U.S. Navy demonstrations of selective tactical deception capabilities can help with communicating these deterrence and commitment messages. Some naval deception capabilities could be demonstrated during routine Western Pacific presence operations, and others during routine exercises with regional allies’ and partners’ navies. By periodically revealing selected COSS weaknesses in peacetime to Chinese and East Asian leaders, these demonstrations can communicate the difficulties the PLA would face in targeting U.S. Navy battleforces under combat conditions. This American-induced deterrent perception is not fundamentally different than China’s desire to induce the deterrent perception that the ASBM would be effective against U.S. Navy battleforces.244 As naval analyst Norman Friedman notes, it is “easier to assert a…capability than to make the limits of that capability obvious.”245 There is ample precedent for this approach. Ocean Venture/Magic Sword North ’81 is but one example of the numerous U.S. military exercises conducted during the early to mid 1980s along the Soviet periphery as part of a larger U.S. political-military psychological campaign aimed at deterring Soviet aggression.246 While a 1980s-scaled and scoped psychological campaign is neither necessary nor desirable against China today, it does outline a conceptual method for communicating U.S. political resolve and naval credibility in support of conventional deterrence by denial. A private diplomatic outreach campaign paired with a long-term U.S. Navy psychological campaign could plant the perception amongst Chinese as well as other East Asian leaders that COSS cannot provide the ASBM reconnaissance-strike system with infallible targeting support let alone maritime omniscience, and that the U.S. would not allow land-based COSS assets to enjoy sanctuary on Chinese soil in the event of a war. If successful, the U.S. could take a large step towards devaluing the ASBM as a coercive political tool. This would contribute in no small way to reinforcing the U.S. East Asian conventional deterrence strategy’s credibility.

HAARP Good: East Asian Influence (2/2)

Sustained US security influence in Asia solves multiple scenarios for conflict

Larry M. Wortzel, Vice President of Foreign Policy and Defense Studies at The Heritage Foundation, “WebMemo #185,” 10 January 2003, 09 http://www.heritage.org/Research/AsiaandthePacific/wm185.cfm

America’s primary regional security interests are best served by preserving the stability of Northeast Asia, an area plagued by war for most of the past century. Without an American military presence, deep historical animosities and territorial disputes among Russia, China, Japan, and the two Koreas would lead to a major race for military dominance. A delicate balance has existed since the end of World War Two, when Japan renounced offensive military force and rejected nuclear weapons. Pulling out US troops would destroy that balance. America’s military presence in Northeast Asia has provided the glue for security arrangements that offered protection to its allies and reassurances that helped avert an arms race among enemies that have fought each other for centuries. America’s bilateral security treaties with Japan and South Korea, respectively, ensure that United States military, political, and economic interests in the region are protected. The forward presence of U.S. troops also serves to protect the democracies of South Korea and Taiwan from hostile threats by Leninist dictatorships in North Korea and China. Japan depends on the presence of U.S. military forces. It maintains its peace constitution, eschews the development of an offensive military force, and feels secure in a nuclear age without a nuclear arsenal because of American security guarantees. For South Korea, the presence of U.S. combat forces has created the conditions that permitted democracy and a market economy to flourish.

SPT Doesn’t Solve

Weapons-ban treaties are only useful under certain circumstances, space weapons is not one of them—no modeling

McKnight ’03 (John Carter, “Let's Weaponize Space”) <http://www.spacedaily.com/news/oped-03d.html>

Multilateral weapons-ban treaties can be useful in certain limited circumstances. They will be obeyed if the technologies they ban are unreliable or obsolescent: this is why the chemical weapons ban has largely been observed. They will be useful if the primary danger is to non-combatants, the weapon's military utility can be met by other means, and their supply can be interdicted - making the recent land mine treaty valuable and effective. Neither set of circumstances applies to space weaponry. Most space weapon proposals involve using space-based means to influence Terrestrial battles, as a defense against ground-to-ground missile attacks, or the sort of space piracy described here. In none of these cases do the weapons systems meet the criteria for an effective treaty ban. The only consequence of such a treaty would be to endanger lives and property in space. As many of the treaty activists are generally anti-space and anti-technology (Rep. Kucinich, though supportive of the NASA center in his district, is the Congressional leader of opposition to biotechnology), such an outcome is probably generally desired by treaty supporters.

Plan Unpopular—Defense Industry

Defense contractors love space weapons—they’d backlash against the plan

Nina Tannenwald, Associate Research Professor at Brown University and PhD in International Relations and Political Theory from Cornell, “Law Versus Power on the High Frontier: The Case for a Rule-Based Regime for Outer Space,” Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, April 2003, <http://www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/files/tannenwald.pdf>

Similar dynamics operate in space. While many telecommunications and satellite firms will have an interest in preserving a stable environment in space in which to do business, other companies have a vested interest in the militarization of space. Large U.S. defense contractors such as Lockheed Martin and Boeing, the No. 1 and No. 2 U.S. military contractors respectively (Boeing is now the world’s largest space company), have a strong interest in the development of the multibillion-dollar U.S. national missile defense. They are the co-heads of the so-called national team being shaped by the Pentagon to integrate more effectively the dozen or so existing missile defense programs. The defense funding bill signed into law January 10, 2002, by President Bush includes a lucrative $8 billion for missile defense development. Other companies involved include Raytheon, TRW, Inc., General Dynamics Corp, and Northrop Grumman. 133 These companies can be expected to lobby heavily for the development of U.S. military capabilities in space, including weapons. Even commercial satellite operators may have a close relationship with the military. Starting in October 2001, the U.S. National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) bought for $1.9 million per month the exclusive rights to all images acquired over Afghanistan by the IKONOS-2 satellite since the Afghanistan conflict began, to prevent the satellite company from selling its pictures elsewhere. IKONOS-2, the world’s highest resolution commercial satellite, was built by a U.S. firm, Space Imaging, and launched in September 1999. 134 The company called its deal with the U.S. government “a wonderful business transaction.” 135 During the 1991 Gulf War, the U.S. government relied on commercial satellite communications services and remote sensing imagery from the French company SPOT Image, while both the Coalition and Iraqi forces used channels on ARABSAT. 136 Imagery of the Gulf region from both SPOT Image and the U.S. Landsat satellite was embargoed during the conflict. 137 In 1996, the United States relied on INTELSAT for communications among field commanders in Bosnia, and in 1999 for Kosovo. 138 According to a report prepared for the Rumsfeld Commission, the Pentagon uses commercial satellite systems for about 60% of its satellite communications needs. The Air Force currently relies on commercial systems for about 50% of its military satellite communications needs, a number it estimates will rise to about 75%. The Air Force is also now the largest customer for commercial satellite imagery in the world. 139 The United States recently decided to make commercial satellites the primary source of data for the CIA’s mapping program, in order to free up the government’s own satellites for more specialized work. 140

Defense industry is hugely influential—campaign contributions prove

Ewing 6-8 (Philip Ewing, “The influence of the defense industry,” DOD Buzz, 6-8-2011, <http://www.dodbuzz.com/2011/06/08/the-influence-of-the-defense-industry/>)

The Sunlight Foundation put up a fascinating blog post this week matching DoD’s top 10 contractors with the amounts they spent on campaign contributions and lobbying between 2009 and 2010. No surprise, the Pentagon’s top firm is Lockheed Martin, but the company that spent the most on lobbying was Boeing, with almost $35 million, followed by Northrop Grumman, with almost $31 million. (And Lockheed was no slouch: It spent almost $26 million, according to Sunlight’s data.) Taken together, America’s top 10 defense contractors spent $15,217,186 on campaign contributions over this period, according to Sunlight’s chart. Collectively, they spent $177,156,664 on lobbying. It would be very interesting to try to figure out the value of the contracts all those companies held during that time, but that sounds like a mind-bending, calculator-melting exercise: For example, would you add up the total value of the F-35 program, or just the payments Lockheed has already received, or just the ones for 2010? As we’ve learned, you can make DoD numbers say almost anything you want. Here’s another sub-narrative: According to Sunlight’s data, United Technologies Corp., whose Pratt & Whitney division makes the F135 engine for the F-35 Lightning II, spent $22.6 million on lobbying in 2009 and 2010. DoD’s list puts General Electric, maker of the alternate F136 engine, as its number 15 contractor for 2010, so it’s not in Sunlight’s top 10 breakdown. But this Bloomberg story from January reported that GE spent $39.3 million on lobbying in 2010, more than any other company. When you add all that together with contributions from GE’s partner, Rolls Royce, it’s easy to understand why the JSF engine war has waged so hot, so long. Another great source for data about the influence of the defense industry is the Center for Responsive Politics. According to its information, the industry has already spent more than $34 million on lobbying so far this year.

Doesn’t Solve Colonization

The Moon is a terrible “jumping off point” for exploring mars and other planets

The Washington Times November 7, 2004 Sunday(http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)

In response to G. Lloyd Helm ("To the moon and onward," Sunday, October 24), while his enthusiasm for manned exploration and settlement of the new frontier of space is commendable, he has a few facts wrong and a few opinions flawed.(1) President Bush did not turn on his own Space Exploration Initiative and "hack away" at NASA and other agencies. He supported some cuts of projects that had little to do with manned exploration, and some cuts were made in Congress rather than at his initiative. But his vision survived the congressional budget process largely intact.(2) Certainly we should return to the moon. Its "dark side," with no atmosphere to distort the stars (which is what makes the stars "twinkle" from Earth) or subject their visibility to urban "light pollution," and as the only spot in the solar system permanently shielded from Earth's massive radio chatter, is the ideal location for an array of optical and radio telescopes. Since the moon turns so slowly on its axis (a lunar "day" is as long as two Earth weeks), there is much more time to resolve distant and faint objects. The moon is geologically stable, with no volcanic activity or earthquakes, and so will have almost no vibrations disrupting precise observation. And since an array can act as a lens as big as the array itself, we put lenses all over the far side and create a "lens" the size of the moon itself, producing images of stunning quality far exceeding any telescope in Earth orbit - we could resolve Earth-sized planets from 100 light years away. Astronomy has driven much of the rest of science so far in human history; we cannot yet fathom what we would learn after we get a view that is not like a smeared, filtered, washed-out, tiny lens.(3) However, while the moon is good for astronomy, it is a poor, barren world, a bad prospect for large-scale colonization. With such low gravity, it cannot retain any atmosphere, and without one, there is no shielding at all against deadly solar flares. With a two-week day/night cycle, sufficient sunlight is unavailable for growing crops, and artificial light is impractical, too weak for farming. Water is so rare that if we found dry concrete, we would mine it for the water. The moon lacks vital substances for human agriculture and industry such as organics, hydrates, carbonates, sulfates, phosphates and salts.(4) Perhaps the most pernicious myth about the moon, which both the president and Mr. Helm seem, sadly, to have swallowed, is that it is a good "jumping off point" to the rest of the heavens because of its lower gravity and we should therefore build bases and spaceports on it. But, creating and building such an infrastructure there would be so costly as to far exceed any fuel savings from taking off there.Besides, as pointed out by aerospace engineer Robert Zubrin, author of "The Case for Mars" and "Entering Space" (and to whom I'm indebted for many of the facts and ideas in this letter), even if an infinite supply of tanks of rocket fuel, already extracted and manufactured, were waiting there for us, for free (and they aren't), the cost of goingto pick it up, either to land and take off again, or to pick it up in orbit from another ship that had taken off, erases the savings. It's like driving from Washington to Baltimore, but diverting to Chicago to take advantage of cheaper gas prices.It makes much more sense to go to your destination directly. And is there a destination that makes sense for large-scale human exploration and settlement? Yes, it has stared us in the face ever since the Apollo program: Mars. In dramatic contrast to the moon, Mars has all the elements and substances, in abundance, necessary for life and industry, including, crucially, water. It has an atmosphere shielding the surface from solar flares and other radiation. By incredible luck, it has a 24-hour day/night cycle like Earth, and its soil is a viable medium for plant growth, so large, cheap, inflatable greenhouses are practical, which is crucially important. People need farms. Over the long run, Mars can be "terraformed," or made to be more Earthlike, with a thicker atmosphere, a warmer climate, and even a shirt-sleeve environment. Mars has as much land as all Earth's continents combined, and it's all open and available. It is truly the next frontier waiting for humanity.And we can get there right now with boring, current technology at reasonable cost. No need to wait for a distant exotic someday. If we focus on going there directly, without distractions and diversions such as orbital/lunar spaceports or futuristic propulsion, and if we "live off the land" by manufacturing water, oxygen and return fuel from abundant and cheap local resources using simple and reliable 19th-century-technology chemical reactions, we can afford a significant program of Martian exploration, with a new crew launched every two years, at about $50 billion over 10 years, which accounts for massive government cost overruns and is a fraction of the current NASA budget of $17 billion a year, which is itself less than 1 percent of federal spending. Truly a small price to pay to give humanity a second world.

Doesn’t Solve Colonization

Moon Colonization is just a fantasy

Reed, 2006 (Fred Reed, writer for Washington Times, “Colonies in space romantic notion”, July 26th, 2011, Lexis)

An idea whose time hasn't come: Colonies in space. The notion never goes away, though. At the Space 2006 conference of the American Aeronautics and Astronautics Association in San Jose, Calif., the participants debated whether to colonize the moon or Mars or just plain space with large orbiting residential satellites, according to an article in Wired.com. These are serious people in the NASA-industrial complex. You hear the same back-to-the-moon and onward-to-Mars sentiments from people throughout the aerospace world. Few ask: Why bother? What can we get from a base on the moon or Mars that comes near justifying the expense? There's little doubt that with enough effort the human race could build such outposts. The problem is that in terms of cost benefit, the usual rationales fall apart. The first question is, "What can a human colony do that unmanned probes can't do far sooner and far more cheaply?" In recent years the unmanned program has been going gangbusters. The Mars rovers Spirit and Opportunity, Cassini to Saturn, Galileo to Jupiter, Mars Express from the European Space Agency, all have been successes. Why send people? Wired quotes Klaus Heiss, the director of the High Frontier(.org), which advocates putting people into space, as saying that a moon base would allow scientists to study the effect of low gravity on humans. But why bother unless you are going to put a colony on the moon? And why do that? Colonization a permanent presence is definitely what a lot of space folk have in mind. High Frontier uses the evocative phrase "Jamestown on the Moon" and speaks of "artificial villages floating in space. There's nothing pernicious in the idea, but why do it? People argue sometimes that, well, we could mine the moon for minerals. The underlying difficulty with this and other reasons for colonies, such as manufacturing things in low or micro-gravity, is the enormous cost of putting weight into space. If we had a truly cheap way of getting lots of materials to Mars or wherever, all sorts of things might make sense. But we don't. To calculate the cost of putting a pound of construction material just into Earth orbit, much less of bringing things back from the moon, you have to include the cost of building the shuttle or expendable rocket, of operating Cape Canaveral, paying its employees their salaries and benefits, paying the aerospace companies to develop and maintain the vehicles, and so on. The result is a very large incentive to find ways to do things on Earth instead. Note that industry, which has to make a profit, is not rushing factories into space. It doesn't make economic sense. Although the arguments for going to Mars or the moon are often couched in terms of science or commercial advantage, I suspect that the advocates know better. What I think really appeals to them (apart from, in some cases, the hope of contracts) is the sheer poetry of it. Think of sitting in your living room on Mars, looking out over that vast, red, bleak but somehow attractive emptiness. Engineers do not lack imagination. Further, they like technical challenges. But it seems to me that if we are going to do things for the romance and adventure of it all, we ought to say so, and be sure that as a nation we think it's worth the very high price. Maybe we do, or will. At this point I don't see anything resembling the necessary public commitment.

Doesn’t Solve Mining

NASA needs to create lunar mining tools before they can break ground

Rob Mueller, engineer for NASA, 2011(<http://www.mining-technology.com/features/feature113053/>) Miningtechnology.com

As starry-eyed an idea as it may seem, preparations are already under way to build a lunar outpost on the moon, an inhabited facility, which could enable long-term excavation, processing and storage.Leading up to the big launch, technologies and machines are being built that will be capable of working in an environment will low gravity, low reaction forces and highly abrasive dust. Spacecraft - both robotic and manned - have also explored the lunar soil, known as regolith, and found some exciting resources that could sustain our environment for years to come. One example is the isotope Helium 3, which, according to experts, has the potential to replace fossil fuels and nuclear power.These resources on the moon are so valuable that several countries are racing to plant their flag there and get to work. The Japanese Aerospace Exploration Agency has announced intentions to plan a manned lunar landing for 2020, which would lead to a manned lunar base by 2030, but there is currently no budget for this project."We are also collaborating with the industry, universities and government agencies."Meanwhile, the China National Space Administration, and Russia's Rocket and Space Corporation Energia are investigating the prospect of lunar mining and setting up office in outer-space. India hasn't been left out of the equation either; in 2008 the country's first unmanned mission to the moon helped it map out the chemical and mineralogical content of the lunar surface, in preparation for future excavation.Not forgetting the USA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has big plans for the moon, which is set to be a testing ground for its future mission to Mars, and beyond. Here, NASA Space Systems Engineer Rob Mueller discusses these plans and talks about the challenges of mining the moon and the key resources that NASA and other countries hope to dig up.Sarah Blackman: How do we know there are minerals worth mining on the moon?Rob Mueller: We have a very good knowledge of what is on the moon and what resources are on the moon, primarily because of our manned Apollo missions. Prior to these, there was a series of robotic missions in the mid-1960s that sent robotic space craft called surveyor space craft. In the early days, nobody knew if the Apollo lander could land on the surface of the moon or whether it would be swallowed up in a large dust cloud - they didn't know whether it was hard or soft. So these surveyors proved that the moon is actually very consolidated. The astronauts on the Apollo missions conducted geotechnical experiments and seismic experiments to measure the properties of the regolith and the actual geotechnical properties of the moon itself. More recently, we have had a mission called the LRO (Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter) LCROSS (Lunar Crater Observation and Sensing Satellite) mission. This was a probe that was sent to the moon about two years ago. The idea was to impact the moon and see what kind of plume was created. By measuring the elements and compounds in that plume we were able to tell what kind of resources there are. From analysing the data from the LCROSS mission found that, in the north and south poles, there are areas that haven't seen sun light for 4.5bn years because they are in permanent shadow. This creates a cold trap where these resources can collect and survive, even in a vacuum.SB: What minerals do you hope to bring back from the moon?RM: The main ingredient that we are interested in on the moon is oxygen because it can be used for breathing air and as a rocket propellant. The regolith has oxygen bound up in the form of calcium oxide, iron oxide and titanium oxide. This regolith can be processed and the oxygen can be extracted. Another resource is the regolith itself; this can be used for radiation shielding or for construction. "These surveyors proved that the moon is actually very consolidated."There is also lots of iron on the moon that doesn't have to be extracted from its mineral forms. But, one of the exciting things is that we have discovered water and water ice on the moon. This could change the future of human space exploration. Another way of getting oxygen is to melt the water ice and electrolyse it to make hydrogen and oxygen. We have also found carbon monoxide, mercury, hydrogen sulphide and ammonia during our missions. SB: Harrison Schmitt from the Apollo 17 mission said that Helium 3, which the moon holds in abundance, has the potential to replace fossil fuels like coal. Does NASA have plans to extract this resource?RM: Yes. One way to enable fusion of energy on earth is to use Helium 3. However, Helium 3 is only available in very, very limited quantities here. The isotope comes from the sun - a giant fusion reactor - and is embedded in the regolith on the moon. So Helium 3 could be mined on the moon, brought back to earth and used in fusion reactors to create energy. SB: Shouldn't we concentrate on the resources we have on earth and create a sustainable environment before taking the moon's and other planet's resources?RM: Well, going to the moon is a model for sustainability because, on the moon, everything you take, in theory, should be recycled so that you can minimise your logistics train. If you think of the moon as a small eco-system that you are building, you can learn to develop new technologies that can be applicable here on earth. It is very expensive to transport things to the moon, so if we can live off the land and use local resources we can reduce these costs and, at the same time, we can learn how to live sustainably in a model community.SB: Have you found that mineral hungry nations are racing to mine for resources on the moon?RM: Yes, I think there has been a lot of interest from many different countries in exploration but there is an issue over property rights. This is something that hasn't been solved yet. Also, if a commercial entity goes and mines minerals on the moon, who do they belong to? These are some of the legal aspects that haven't been worked out yet.SB: What challenges would you face when mining on the moon that you wouldn't have to face on earth?RM: It is very different to mining on earth, primarily because of the low gravity; the gravity on the moon is about 1/6 of the gravity on earth. When you go to a typical mine on earth you will find heavy machinery such as large excavators. First of all, we won't be able to transport this type of equipment to the moon, and when you get there, the reaction forces are very low. So, we have to reinvent all the equipment that goes there and that's a big challenge. We need to address how to operate in a vacuum environment, away from the earth for five years or more with zero maintenance. Also, the lunar soil has highly abrasive dust which tends to damage equipment, so the life-time of equipment is a big issue on the moon. The best solution to avoid damage from the dust is to keep it off in the first place, so we are developing all kinds of seals, covers, mechanisms and shielding to keep the dust away. SB: What are the steps involved in acquiring resources on the moon? RM: The first step is transportation; you have to bring the machines to the surface of the moon from the earth. Once you have brought it there, you have to deploy the machine from the lander. Then, once the machine is on the surface of the moon, it has to dig and acquire the regolith. Then it has to transport the regolith back to a chemical plant on the lander and the plant processes the regolith in order to extract the resource, for example hydrogen and oxygen. For greater efficiency, these resources need to be cryogenically stored in liquid form. SB: Are you collaborating with the mining industry to help with your research?"One way to enable fusion of energy on earth is to use Helium 3."RM:We are also collaborating with the industry, universities and government agencies to get the best knowledge we can to provide the best solutions for mining on the moon and other planets. We currently have a contract with Caterpillar which is called the Innovative Partnerships Programme and we collaborating with them for autonomy technologies. Caterpillar is interested in removing the man from the machine so that the machine can be driven remotely. In a deep mine this is much more efficient because it can operate 24/7 and there is a better safety aspect to it. In terms of collaborating with universities, we have a competition called the NASA Lunar Robotics Mining Competition. Last year 22 universities came to the finals at the Kennedy Space Centre in Florida. The goal is very simple, design a robot that can dig and deliver the most lunar regolith to a hopper that is 1m above the ground to win. We have a minimum requirement of 10kg,so in order to win a prize you have to deposit at least 10kg into that hopper

Doesn’t Solve Exploration

**Exploration is impossible—everyone will become dyslexic.**

**Reynolds PhD., no date** (Dr. Christopher Reynolds, B.A., M.A., B.D., PhD, Managing director of British Institute for Learning Development. “Why Man Can’t Live on the Moon.” <http://www.british-ild.com/downloads/articles/moon.pdf>

Since Neil Armstrong first stepped on the moon in 1968, people have dreamed that one day man (mankind) could live on the moon. Escaping from a polluted earth, retreat from a nuclear war, or establishing a moon base for future space exploration have all been serious considerations for moon settlement. Yet, for the past 40 years space travelers have been confined mainly to orbiting the earth. Living on the moon, we now realise, is a bigger problem than first envisaged. While the development and maintenance of sophisticated equipment has been a primary concern so has the maintenance of the software of the human brain.

Apart from questions of the expense of moon settlement or even the benefits of space tourism, the reality is that man can't live on the moon because the effects of weightlessness cause dyslexia.

In sending all those highly intelligent astronauts into space, NASA has discovered that their astronauts couldn't complete and properly record the results of the million dollar experiments they had planned. This, of course, caused problems. When big companies had paid big dollars to have complex experiments carried out in conditions of weightlessness, the last thing they wanted was for the experiments to be carried out by a serious dyslexic.

Mining Bad

Lunar mining bad for the moon’s environment

Tangum ‘92 (Richard, Ph.D., Texas A&M University; M.Arc Environmental System, Virginia Tech University Professor, “Future Space Development Scenarios: Environmental Considerations” Space resources. Volume 4: Social concerns. NASA SP-509. Washington, DC: NASA, 1992., p.220, <http://nss.org/settlement/nasa/spaceresvol4/environment.html>)

Mining of the lunar surface is an area of potential environmental concern. This issue was voiced by the Lunar Base Working Group, meeting at Los Alamos National Laboratory in 1984: Most lunar scientific activities require that the unique lunar environment be preserved. Lunar base operations might affect this environment in adverse ways, especially if industrial operations expand.Specific potential environmental impacts were cited: increased atmospheric pressure, which could change atmospheric composition and compromise astronomical observations, and increased very low radio frequency background through satellite communication networks, which could affect the use of the far side of the Moon for radio telescopes.

Unprotected by any atmosphere, the Moon will accumulate scars of impacts by humans at an increasing rate. In contrast, the Earth will exhibit a more youthful appearance, since it is constantly rejuvenated by geological processes such as erosion by wind and water. On the Moon, micrometeoritic action turns over the top 3 mm of the lunar surface every 1,000,000 years (Gault et al. 1975). In this time span, the lunar surface is destroyed, recreated, and shaped. Extensive mining efforts on the Moon, however, could scar its surface irreversibly. Numerous components of mining on the Moon must be environmentally assessed: the scale of the mining operation, its associated development, and its technological features. Factors affecting the scale of mining include: Ore quality, Size of ore body, Availability of energy, Cost of operation, Type of operation. Strip mining would probably be the most efficient method for producing ore (see fig. 16. Artistic rendering of a "three-drum slusher." It is similar to a simple two-drum dragline, in which a bucket is pulled by cables to scrape up surface material and dump it into a waiting truck. The third drum allows the bucket to be moved from side to side to enlarge the mining pit Surface mining of unconsolidated lunar regolith, using versions of draglines or front-end loaders, will probably be done at a lunar base initially, although deeper "bedrock" mining is also a possibility and underground mining may even be attractive if appropriate resources are located.). There could remain the desolation of steep piles of discarded regolith, alternating with the trenches from which the regolith is removed. The Moon, in time, could become a visual and scientific wasteland. Laws requiring backfilling of the trenches and recontouring of the ground surface to some semblance of its original state would be needed. Development and technological features affecting the environmental impact include: Size of mining installation (land required), Volume of spoil generated, Nature of energy, source used, Nature of transportation system used, Nature and volume of pollution released, Drilling processes. Oxidic minerals will probably be the first resource mined on the Moon for life support and rocket propellant. Although projected ore volume for initial production of oxygen would be low (82 cubic meters of unconcentrated fines per day), eventual development of larger settlements would require a vast mining operation to sustain them. Approximately 100,000 tons of regolith (10-percent usable ilemite content) are needed to produce 1000 tons of oxygen in a carbothermal oxygen production plant (Cutler and Krag 1985). this translates into a mining operation that extracts 50,000 cubic meters of regolith for each 1000 tons of oxygen produced. Selenopolis, a fully developed lunar settlement envisioned by Krafft Ehricke (1985), could require vast quantities of oxygen per year for its inhabitants' use for life support and rocket propellant. Annually to produce 500,000 tons of oxygen, an area 7.07 kilometers square and 5 meters deep would have to be mined. Although the Moon does not have an atmosphere as such, it does have an exosphere in which individual particles are captured by its gravitational field. Each one of the Apollo missions between 1969 and 1972 added more than 10 tons of exhaust gases to the exosphere. Over the 3-year period, more than 60 tons of gases were released on the lunar surface. And the five Luna missions that returned samples from the Moon between 1970 and 1976 probably added a similar amount. Although subsequent measurements failed to detect their presence, these gases had a sufficiently high molecular weight that their dispersal from the gravitational field of the Moon would occur only through a very slow process. What happened to these gases? A likely answer suggested by Zdenek Kopal (1979) is that the gases were rapidly absorbed by the lunar crust and bound in a solid state. The implications of the release of large quantities of gases of different types is unknown. We must remember that the Moon, in its pristine condition, serves as an important, well preserved fossil of the solar system. Much remains to be discovered about the evolution of the Earth and the solar system. Very little geological evidence has been discovered about the first billion years of Earth's 4-1/2 billion year history. Geological discoveries on the Moon will continue to clarify Moon-Earth and solar system history (see box). unmanaged development of the Moon (Would-be developers may find this image of the Moon overly optimistic, at least by the year 2000. But environmentalists like Rick Tangum may view the image, by visual futurist Syd Mead, more pessimistically. Tangum is concerned about the scale of a mining operation necessary to support a large lunar settlement Unmanaged development of the Moon could destroy its potential to reveal scientific information about the early history of the solar system.

Mining Bad: Meteorites

**Mining the moon is a huge risk**

**Shimkus ’11** (John, May 9, 2011‘Mining Helium-3 will Transform the Dark Side of the Moon’ http://www.energydigital.com/global\_mining/mining-helium-3-will-transform-dark-side-of-the-moon)

There is a dark side, however, to mining the Moon. Let us not forget that the Moon’s orbit dictates the ebb and flow of various systems here on Earth. From sea tides to weather patterns, animal mating habits to plant growth, even plate tectonics, a number of the Earth’s systems are reliant on the Moon’s consistent circumnavigation of the planet to function properly. If we remove millions of tons of helium-3 and other minerals from the moon and bring them to Earth, the celestial balance that drives those patterns may be thrown off. What’s worse, mining activities tend to use explosives, and in low gravity, who’s to say that we may not fracture the moon entirely, hurling giant lunar meteorites toward Earth? Transforming the Moon into a mining hub is certainly risky business, but it’s bound to be a profitable reality very soon!

Fusion Doesn’t Solve

**Nuclear fusion doesn’t work now—He-3 too rare and expensive to consider mining the moon**

**Laskow 7-11** (Sarah, reporter based in New York City who covers environment, energy, and sustainability issues, among other things, 7/11/2011, “Strip-mining the moon: bad idea or the worst idea?”, <http://www.grist.org/list/2011-07-11-strip-mining-the-moon-bad-idea-or-the-worst-idea>) DOA: 07/26/2011

As a millennial, I don't share boomers' enthusiasm for the power of science to solve all problems. So when someone says that strip-mining the Moon for rocks rich in helium-3, heating the rocks to harvest the helium, and using that helium for nuclear fusion will solve the world's energy problems, I am inclined to say, “Ha! You power-mad old person, you are living in a science fiction story.” But that, in fact, may be the direction humanity is heading in, Moon-wise. Strip-mining the Moon won't be profitable until scientists perfect nuclear fusion. So far they've only gotten that process going for a few seconds, but real non-made-up scientists contacted for this post said that "It's totally possible. We're totally going to do it. It's going to be awesome." Helium-3 would produce a clean fusion process, leaving little of the radioactive waste that plagues nuclear fission, the process that nuclear plants use now. But Helium-3 is found rarely on Earth and is therefore worth $16 million dollars per kilo. With prices like that, resource extraction on the Moon all of a sudden becomes a fairly reasonable economic activity to pursue. EVEN THOUGH IT IS INSANE. Seriously, does this sound like a bad idea to anyone else? I, for one, am worried that pursuing the so-called "golden dream of nuclear fusion" will have some unintended consequences. But at least we’ll know what to tell the monkey when it asks why we’re blowing up the Moon:

1NC—LFTR CP

The United States federal government should substantially increase funding for the development of Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors.

Solves warming and resource shortages

Robert Hargraves [PhD physics Brown University, taught mathematics and computer science at Dartmouth, founded a software company, worked as an IT consultant for energy and other companies worldwide, led information technology at Boston Scientific] Summary of Presentation to BRC, USFG Blue Ribbon Commission for America’s Nuclear Future. August 30, 2010 Google It.

I recommend a specific project to develop LFTR in 5 years, for $1 billion, as the Gen IV International Forum estimates suggest. Then provide the nuclear industry with the R&D knowledge and encourage factory production and competition. What is the benefit of installing a 100 MW LFTR each day? If LFTRs replace coal power plants, 10 billion tons of worldwide CO2 emissions will be zeroed in 38 years. A high temperature LFTR allows efficient dissociation of water to make hydrogen, which is a feedstock to synthesize fuels. We can recycle some carbon from coal plants to synthesize gasoline and diesel vehicle fuel substitutes, or make ammonia for non-carbon fuel or fertilizer. Providing the developing nations with safe, affordable electric power can increase their prosperity to allow lifestyles that include lower birthrates, stabilizing world population. But advanced nuclear fission R&D has dropped, and there is none for LFTR. Compared to $16 billion spent on liquid metal fast breeder reactors, DOE will spend $103 million on the prolonged high temperature gas reactor development. The advanced fuel cycles budget has no money for closed fuel cycles nor for liquid fuels. A specific LFTR project will have specific tangible results: - cut 10 billion tons of CO2 emissions by 2058. - avoid carbon taxes. - improve developing world prosperity, and check population growth. - avoid weapons proliferation by obviating the need for uranium enrichment plants. - reduce radio-toxic waste; consume world fissile material stocks. - use inexhaustible thorium fuel, available in all nations.

LFTR Solvency

LFTR solves shortages—it’s the cheapest and cleanest tech

Robert Hargraves [PhD physics Brown University, taught mathematics and computer science at Dartmouth, founded a software company, worked as an IT consultant for energy and other companies worldwide, led information technology at Boston Scientific] Summary of Presentation to BRC, USFG Blue Ribbon Commission for America’s Nuclear Future. August 30, 2010 Google It.

LFTR may make energy cheaper than from coal at a capital cost near $2/watt. One indication is that five independent historical cost estimates center on $1.98/watt. Another reason is that LFTR needs no costly 160-atmosphere pressure vessel and containment dome. LFTR is small. The workman in the center of the AP-1000 is about the same size as the "fireball" molten salt reactor designed for flight. Intrinsic safety reduces the need for costly defense in depth. There are no pressurized radioactive materials to contain. The fuel is already melted down. Loss of power drains fuel to safe dump tanks. The high heat capacity of molten salt allows a compact core and high temperature. The high temperature enables power conversion efficiencies up to 50%, halving today's water cooling needs or enabling dry air cooling. Factory production cuts costs. Boeing aircraft produces similar cost units with similar concerns about materials, quality, and life safety. Factory produced LFTR reactors will benefit from the learning curve, expected to reduce costs 10% for every doubling of units produced.

AT: Nuclear Fission Bad

LFTR is different from other nuclear reactors. Its more efficient, doesn’t produce waste, and thorium fuel is inexhaustible

Robert Hargraves [PhD physics Brown University, taught mathematics and computer science at Dartmouth, founded a software company, worked as an IT consultant for energy and other companies worldwide, led information technology at Boston Scientific] Summary of Presentation to BRC, USFG Blue Ribbon Commission for America’s Nuclear Future. August 30, 2010 Google It.

Alvin Weinberg foresaw today's energy and atmospheric CO2 crises. He directed Oak Ridge to design and test another successful molten salt reactor experiment. It was tested with U-233, intended to be made from thorium. Nuclear fission of U-233 takes place in the central (yellow) core of a liquid fluoride thorium reactor. Some released neutrons continue the chain reaction, and some pass into the (green) thorium blanket surrounding the core, converting thorium to U-233. The uranium separator (on the left) sends thorium back to the blanket and U-233 to the core to replace that which was consumed. Fission product waste is similarly separated. Heat from the fissioning core is exchanged with a salt that heats a gas to run the turbine-generator. Using thorium for fuel is one key concept. Another is the liquid fuel form. Uranium and thorium are dissolved in molten salts of lithium and beryllium. The liquid's high heat capacity enables high temperatures, efficiency, and compactness. Chemical processing takes place in continuous streams. The LFTR (liquid fluoride thorium reactor) is started up with a fissile material, but none is transferred in or out thereafter. Thorium is inexhaustible, unlike uranium. Once fission products decay, the long-lived radio-toxic actinide wastes from LFTR are orders of magnitude less than from today's power reactors.

1NC—NADR CP

Text: The United States federal government should substantially increase funding for anti-proliferation and anti-terrorism programs included within the Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs Account.

NADR solves prolif

United States General Accounting Office (GAO), “Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, demining, and Related Programs Follow Legal Authority, but Some Activities Need Reassessment,” Report to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, April 2004, accessed 8/15/09 http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04521.pdf

There are three major nonproliferation programs: The NDF funds projects to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, their delivery systems, and related materials. The Export Control and Related Border Security Assistance Program assists other governments in implementing effective export control systems to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their missile delivery systems as well as conventional weapons. The Science Centers and Bio-Chem Redirection Program finances civilian research by former Soviet nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons scientists to provide incentives that would prevent them from marketing their skills to other countries. The fiscal year 2005 budget request refers to this program as the Nonproliferation of WMD (weapons of mass destruction) Expertise Program.

NADR Solvency: Prolif

Science centers check Soviet brain drain through research grants and facilitation of long-term civilian activities – more funding ensures more complete coverage

Anthony Wier, Former Research Associate for Harvard’s Project on Managing the Atom and current Staff Member for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, “Securing the Bomb: Stabilizing Employment for Nuclear Personnel: International Science and Technology Centers,” Nuclear Threat Initiative , last updated on 5 November 2002, accessed 8/15/09 http://www.nti.org/e\_research/cnwm/stabilizing/istc.asp

The International Science and Technology Centers are a multilateral effort to provide opportunities for scientists of the former Soviet Union with weapons of mass destruction (WMD) expertise to engage in peaceful research — both basic and applied. The goal of the two Centers, based in Moscow and Kiev, is to reduce the likelihood — if possible, to zero — that such scientists or the institutes at which they work would be tempted to provide their expertise to terrorists or proliferating states. They do this by providing grants to fund peaceful research by former weapons scientists, combined with some efforts to facilitate these scientists' transition to long-term, sustainable civilian activities. The program includes nuclear weapons scientists, but it welcomes all "weapons scientists and engineers, particularly those who possess knowledge and skills related to weapons of mass destruction or missile delivery systems," in the former Soviet Union.[1] One of the longest run cooperative proliferation threat reduction programs, in 2001, the Bush administration cited the International Science and Technology Centers in its review of nonproliferation and threat reduction assistance to Russia as one of four programs identified for expansion.[2] According to the U.S. State Department, as of April 2002, since their inception the Centers had "engaged," i.e. supported through financial grant, training, or administrative support, nearly 50,000 former Soviet scientists and engineers.[3] According to the State Department, roughly half of these are "senior scientists.[4] By comparison, State Department officials estimate that there were somewhere between 30,000 and 75,000 senior scientists and engineers in the former Soviet complex, though they note that "The United States national security community has never established a definitive estimate of the total [former Soviet Union] WMD scientific population."[5]

NDF ensures stability and safe removal of fissile material – empirically proven

John S. Wolf, Assistant Secretary for Nonproliferation in the US Department of State, Testimony Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 19 March 2003, accessed 8/15/09 http://merln.ndu.edu/merln/pfiraq/archive/state/18835pf.pdf

Another tool we use to curb supply globally is our Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, for which the President has requested $35 million in FY 2004, more than double the FY 2003 appropriation. NDF has tackled tough, urgent, and often unanticipated problems on a worldwide basis. In the recent past, it has negotiated and executed the removal of Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) from Serbia, the destruction of missiles in Bulgaria and the return from Cyprus of nuclear reactor parts en route to the Middle East. The NDF has also led a successful international effort to develop a state-of-the-art automated tracking system referred to as Tracker designed to help governments strengthen their control over sensitive exports or transshipments. Tracker has been a key tool for engaging nearly two dozen countries -- either as design partners, current users, or in discussions of future implementation. Now deployed throughout Central Europe to track sensitive exports, this system is increasingly of interest to countries in Western Europe and Asia as a means to track terrorists and to monitor the movement of dangerous materials. The State Department is closely coordinating this export control assistance tool with other U.S. equipment assistance provided to these states.

Calculation Good

Calculation is inevitable, it’s only a question of whether we calculate for or against the Other – their attempts to be free of calculation ensures that their ethic is co-opted

Jacques Derrida, Directeur d’Etudes at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, and Professor of Philosophy, French and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, 2002, Acts of Religion, p. 255-57

This excess of justice over law and calculation, this overflowing of the unpre­sentable over the determinable, cannot and should not [ne peut pas et ne doit pas] serve as an alibi for staying out of juridico-political battles, within an institution or a state, between institutions or states. Abandoned to itself, the incalculable and giv­ing [donatrice] idea of justice is always very close to the bad, even to the worst for it can always be reappropriated by the most perverse calculation. It is always possible, and this is part of the madness of which we were speaking. An absolute assurance against this risk can only saturate or suture the opening of the call to justice, a call that is always wounded. But incalculable justice commands calculation. And first of all, closest to what one associates with justice, namely, law, the juridical field that one cannot isolate within sure frontiers, but also in all the fields from which one cannot separate it, which intervene in it and are no longer simply fields: the ethical, the political, the economical, the psycho-sociological, the philosophical, the liter­ary, etc. Not only must one [il faut] calculate, negotiate the relation between the calculable and the incalculable, and negotiate without a rule that would not have to be reinvented there where we are “thrown’ there where we find ourselves; but one must [il faut] do so and take it as far as possible, beyond the place we find our­selves and beyond the already identifiable zones of morality, politics, or law, beyond the distinctions between national and international, public and private, and so on. The order of this il faut does not properly belong either to justice or to law. It only belongs to either realm by exceeding each one in the direction of the other—which means that, in their very heterogeneity, these two orders are undis­sociable: de facto and de jure [en fait et en droit]. Politicization, for example, is interminable even if it cannot and should not ever be total. To keep this from being a truism, or a triviality, one must recognize in it the following consequence: each advance in politicization obliges one to reconsider, and so to reinterpret the very foundations of law such as they had previously been calculated or delimited. This was true for example in the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, in the abolition of slavery, in all the emancipatory battles that remain and will have to remain in progress, everywhere in the world, for men and for women. Nothing seems to me less outdated than the classical emancipatory ideal. One cannot attempt to disqualify it today, whether crudely or with sophistication, without at least some thoughtlessness and without forming the worst complicities. It is true that it is also necessary to re-elaborate, without renouncing, the concept of eman­cipation, enfranchisement, or liberation while taking into account the strange structures we have been describing. But beyond these identified territories of juridico-politicization on the grand geo-political scale, beyond all self-serving misappropriations and hijackings, beyond all determined and particular reappropria­tions of international law, other areas must constantly open up that can at first resemble secondary or marginal areas. This marginality also signifies that a vio­lence, even a terrorism and other forms of hostage taking are at work. The exam­ples closest to us would be found in the area of laws [lois] on the teaching and practice of languages, the legitimization of canons, the military use of scientific research, abortion, euthanasia, problems of organ transplant, extra-uterine con­ception, bio-engineering, medical experimentation, the “social treatment” of AIDS, the macro- or micro-politics of drugs, homelessness, and so on, without forgetting; of course, the treatment of what one calls animal life, the immense question of so-called animality. On this last problem, the Benjamin text that I am coming to now shows that its author was not deaf or insensitive to it, even if his propositions on this subject remain quite obscure or traditional.

Discourse Bad

Policy analysis should precede discourse – most effective way to challenge power

Jill Taft-Kaufman, Speech prof @ CMU, 1995, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, “Other Ways”, p pq

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

Epistemology Bad

Their epistemology indicts don't decrease the value of our truth claims - epistemological uncertainty doesn't preclude taking action to stop suffering

Tyler Cowen, Department of Economics at George Mason University, "The Epistemic Problem Does Not Refute Consequentialism," 2 November 2004, http://www.gmu.edu/jbc/Tyler/Epistemic2.pdf, p. 14-15)

The epistemic critique relies heavily on a complete lack of information about initial circumstances. This is not a plausible general assumption, although it may sometimes be true. The critique may give the impression of relying more heavily on a more plausible assumption, namely a high variance for the probability distribution of our estimates concerning the future. But simply increasing the level of variance or uncertainty does not add much force to the epistemic argument. To see this more clearly, consider another case of a high upfront benefit. Assume that the United States has been hit with a bioterror attack and one million children have contracted smallpox. We also have two new experimental remedies, both of which offer some chance of curing smallpox and restoring the children to perfect health. If we know for sure which remedy works, obviously we should apply that remedy. But imagine now that we are uncertain as to which remedy works. The uncertainty is so extreme that each remedy may cure somewhere between three hundred thousand and six hundred thousand children. Nonetheless we have a slight idea that one remedy is better than the other. That is, one remedy is slightly more likely to cure more children, with no other apparent offsetting negative effects or considerations. Despite the greater uncertainty, we still have the intuition that we should try to save as many children as possible. We should apply the remedy that is more likely to cure more children. We do not say: “We are now so uncertain about what will happen. We should pursue some goal other than trying to cure as many children as possible.” Nor would we cite greater uncertainty about longer-run events as an argument against curing the children. We have a definite good in the present (more cured children), balanced against a radical remixing of the future on both sides of the equation. The definite upfront good still stands firm. Alternatively, let us assume that our broader future suddenly became less predictable (perhaps genetic engineering is invented, which creates new and difficult-to-forecast possibilities). That still would not diminish the force of our reason for saving more children. The variance of forecast becomes larger on both sides of the equation – whether we save the children or not – and the value of the upfront lives remains. A higher variance of forecast might increase the required size of the upfront benefit (to overcome the Principle of Roughness), but it would not refute the relevance of consequences more generally. We could increase the uncertainty more, but consequentialism still will not appear counterintuitive. The remedies, rather than curing somewhere in the range of three to six hundred thousand children, might cure in the broader range of zero to all one million of the children. By all classical statistical standards, this new cure scenario involves more uncertainty than the previous case, such as by having a higher variance of possible outcomes. Yet this higher uncertainty lends little support for the view that curing the children becomes less important. We still have an imperative to apply the remedy that appears best, and is expected the cure the greater number of children. This example may appear excessively simple, but it points our attention to the non-generality of the epistemic critique. The critique appears strongest only when we have absolutely no idea about the future; this is a special rather than a general case. Simply boosting the degree of background generic uncertainty should not stop us from pursuing large upfront benefits of obvious importance.

Ontology Bad

It’s impossible to determine an answer to being – ontological questioning is infinitely regressive and paralyzing

Emmanuel Levinas, professor of philosophy, and Philippe Nemo, professor of new philosophy, Ethics and Infinity, 1985, pg. 6-7

Are we not in need of still more precautions? Must we not step back from this question to raise another, to recognize the obvious circularity of ask­ing what isthe “What is . .?“ question? It seems to beg the question. Is our new suspicion, then, that Heidegger begs the question of metaphysics when he asks “What is poetry?” or “What is thinking?”? Yet his thought is insistently anti-metaphysical. Why, then, does he retain the metaphysical question par excellence? Aware of just such an objection, he pro­poses, against the vicious circle of the *petitio principi,* an alternative, productive circularity: hermeneutic questioning. To ask “What is. . .?“ does not partake of onto-theo-logy if one acknowledges (1) that the answer can never be fixed absolutely, but calls essen­tially, endlessly, for additional “What is . . .?“ questions. Dialectical refinement here replaces vicious circularity. Further, beyond the openmindedness called for by dialectical refinement, hermeneutic questioning (2) insists on avoiding subjective impositions, on avoid­ing reading into rather than harkening to things. One must harken to the things themselves, ultimately to being, in a careful attunement to what is. But do the refinement and care of the herme­neutic question — which succeed in avoiding onto­theo-logy succeed in avoiding all viciousness? Certainly they convert a simple fallacy into a produc­tive inquiry, they open a path for thought. But is it not the case that however much refinement and care one brings to bear, to ask what something is leads to asking what something else is, and so on and so forth, ad infinitum*?* What is disturbing in this is not so much the infinity of interpretive depth, which has the virtue of escaping onto-theo-logy and remaining true to the way things are, to the phenomena, the coming to be and passing away of being. Rather, the problem lies in the influence the endlessly open horizon of such thinking exerts on the way of such thought. That is, the problem lies in what seems to be the very virtue of hermeneutic thought, namely, the doggedness of the “What is . . .?“ question, in its inability to escape itself, to escape being and essence.

AT: Value to Life

Value to life inevitable – existence key to maximize it

David Pizer 2001“Argument that life has inherent value”, July 8, <http://www.cryonet.org/cgi-bin/dsp.cgi?msg=16930>

Argument that life has inherent value 1. The concept of value comes from what living beings will pay for something. How much one being is willing to give in order to get something he wants is a way to think of the value of that thing. What a being is willing to pay for something depends on how much he desires that thing. So indirectly, desire is what actually sets the value of something. 2. In order to desire something, the thing doing the desiring must be alive - it must be a living being. So value, the end of desire, is dependent on life. Only living things (living beings) can give value to something else. 3. In order for any first thing to give something to a second thing, the first thing must first have it to give. So if only living things can give value, then living things must have value. 4. Desire can only come from, (and so must be in), living beings. So when living things desire something, that desire must be inherent in the living things. If desire in living things is what gives value to other things, and that desire is inherent in the living thing, then living things, or life, has inherent value in it. Or to say it another way: If an object gives something value, that object must have value in it as a quality to give. Example: For me to love my dog, I must first have love in me. For me to value my dog, I must first have value in me. 5. Put another way, if a living being has some quality, that quality is a part of what makes that being what it is. 6.If life gives value to life, than one of the parts of life is value. Put another way, value cannot exist without life, so value is life and life is value. 7. If value is only relative, then saying life being valuable relative to life is the same as saying life has worth relative to life. Anything that is relative to itself is an unconditional part of itself and therefore has "inherentness". 8.THEREFORE, anyway you look at it, life is value and value is life - and life has inherent value.

Generic Perm

Reformism can challenge the state effectively

Chris Dixon, “Reflections on Privilege, Reformism, and Activism: A response to sasha k's “‘Activism’ and ‘Anarcho-Purism’”,” The Anarchist Library, 2005, accessed 4/18/10 http://theanarchistlibrary.org/HTML/Chris\_Dixon\_\_Reflections\_on\_Privilege\_\_Reformism\_\_and\_Activism\_\_A\_response\_to\_sasha\_k\_s\_\_\_Activism\_\_and\_\_Anarcho-Purism\_\_.html

Evidently sasha doesn't grasp my argument in "Finding Hope." Or else he disagrees. It's difficult to tell because, while skillfully sidestepping engagement with my discussion of privilege, he also sidesteps the main thrust of my essay: rethinking radicalism, particularly in the context of privilege. As I wrote, "we have to move beyond the myopic view--often endemic among anarchists--that the most 'important' activism only or mainly happens in the streets, enmeshed in police confrontations." In other words, spheres of traditional 'radical action' are limited and limiting. And though I don't believe that sasha fundamentally disagrees with this criticism, he refuses to accept its broader consequences. For instance, where I question the bounds of 'radicalism' with examples of struggles like opposing prison construction and establishing community and cultural centers, he conclusively points to "a set of demands and goals of which none suggest any serious critique of capitalism and the state in their totality." There is much more to the "totality" that we all confront than capitalism and the state. That's unequivocal. Furthermore, a "totality" has an undeniable physical presence, and people do in fact contest and resist it every day through a variety of struggles using a variety of means--not all containing the "serious critique" necessary to satisfy sasha. J. Kellstadt nicely observes this, noting that an 'activist' perspective (not unlike sasha's) overlooks a whole layer of more "everyday" forms of resistance - from slacking off, absenteeism, and sabotage, to shopfloor "counter-planning" and other forms of autonomous and "unofficial" organizing - which conventional activists and leftists (including most anarchists) have a bad track record of acknowledging. And this still leaves out all of those modes of struggle which take place beyond the shopfloor, such as various forms of cultural and sexual revolution. Unfortunately, sasha doesn't deign to discuss these all-too-pedestrian realities, many of which potentially embrace the very anarchist ethics he touts. They certainly have bearing on the lives of many folks and speak to a breadth of social struggle, but they apparently don't constitute a sufficient "critique." Even if sasha were to acknowledge their importance, my sense is that he would erect a rationalized theoretical division between Kellstadt's "everyday forms of resistance" and 'reformism.' No doubt, he would use a rhetorical sleight of hand on par with the "simple fact of language that those who want to reform the present system are called reformists." A seemingly irrefutable, self-apparent statement, this actually glosses over legitimate questions: Are 'reformists' so easily discernable and cleanly categorized? Are all 'reforms' equal? Can they be part of a long-term revolutionary strategy? So let's talk plainly about reformism. No matter how much some might wish otherwise, it simply isn't a cut-and-dry issue. And while it actually deserves a book-length examination, here I'll sketch some general considerations. Principally, I ask, assuming that we share the goal of dismantling systems of power and restructuring our entire society in nonhierarchical ways, what role does reform play? Must we eschew it, unconditionally embrace it, or is there another approach? sasha steadfastly represents one rather limited 'radical' view. To bolster his critique of 'reformism,' for instance, he critically cites one of the examples in my essay: demanding authentic public oversight of police. "[This] might be a small step for social change in some general sense," he argues, "but ultimately it is a step backwards as it strengthens the legitimacy of the police and of imposed decision." I respect the intent of this critique; it makes sense if one is privileged enough to engage with the police on terms of one's own choosing. Yet in real life, it's both simplistic and insulated. Look at it this way: accepting sasha's argument, are we to wait until the coming insurrectionary upheaval before enjoying an end to police brutality? More specifically, are African-American men to patiently endure the continued targeting of "driving while Black"? Should they hold off their demands for police accountability so as to avoid strengthening "the legitimacy of the police and of imposed decision"? And if they don't, are they 'reformists'? Many folks who experience daily police occupation understand that ending the "imposed decision" (often epitomized by police) will require radical change, and they work toward it. At the same time, they demand authentic public oversight of police forces. The two don't have to be mutually exclusive. I'll even suggest that they can be complementary, especially if we acknowledge the legacies of white supremacy and class stratification embedded in policing. Ultimately, we need a lucid conception of social change that articulates this kind of complementarity. That is, we need revolutionary strategy that links diverse, everyday struggles and demands to long-term radical objectives, without sacrificing either. Of course, this isn't to say that every so-called 'progressive' ballot initiative or organizing campaign is necessarily radical or strategic. Reforms are not all created equal. But some can fundamentally shake systems of power, leading to enlarged gains and greater space for further advances. Andre Gorz, in his seminal book Strategy for Labor, refers to these as "non-reformist" or "structural" reforms. He contends, "a struggle for non-reformist reforms--for anti-capitalist reforms--is one which does not base its validity and its right to exist on capitalist needs, criteria, and rationales. A non-reformist reform is determined not in terms of what can be, but what should be." Look to history for examples: the end of slavery, the eight-hour workday, desegregation. All were born from long, hard struggles, and none were endpoints. Yet they all struck at the foundations of power (in these cases, the state, white supremacy, and capitalism), and in the process, they created new prospects for revolutionary change. Now consider contemporary struggles: amnesty for undocumented immigrants, socialized health care, expansive environmental protections, indigenous sovereignty. These and many more are arguably non-reformist reforms as well. None will single-handedly dismantle capitalism or other systems of power, but each has the potential to escalate struggles and sharpen social contradictions. And we shouldn't misinterpret these efforts as simply meliorative incrementalism, making 'adjustments' to a fundamentally flawed system. Certainly that tendency exists, but there are plenty of other folks working very consciously within a far more radical strategy, pushing for a qualitative shift in struggle. "To fight for alternative solutions," Gorz writes, "and for structural reforms (that is to say, for intermediate objectives) is not to fight for improvements in the capitalist system; it is rather to break it up, to restrict it, to create counter-powers which, instead of creating a new equilibrium, undermine its very foundations." Thankfully, this is one approach among a diverse array of strategies, all of which encompass a breadth of struggles and movements. Altogether, they give me hope.

Predictions Good

Rejecting predictions only produces intellectual and political conservatism that makes the impact inevitable

Michael Fitzsimmons, defense analyst, The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning, Survival 48.4, Winter 2006/2007

It should follow, then, that in planning under conditions of risk, variability in strategic calculation should be carefully tailored to available analytic and decision processes. Why is this important? What harm can an imbalance between complexity and cognitive or analytic capacity in strategic planning bring? Stated simply, where analysis is silent or inadequate, the personal beliefs of decision-makers fill the void. As political scientist Richard Betts found in a study of strategic surprise, in ‘an environment that lacks clarity, abounds with conflicting data, and allows no time for rigorous assessment of sources and validity, ambiguity allows intuition or wishfulness to drive interpretation ... The greater the ambiguity, the greater the impact of preconceptions.’16 The decision-making environment that Betts describes here is one of political-military crisis, not long-term strategic planning. But a strategist who sees uncertainty as the central fact of his environment brings upon himself some of the pathologies of crisis decision-making. He invites ambiguity, takes conflicting data for granted and substitutes a priori scepticism about the validity of prediction for time pressure as a rationale for discounting the importance of analytic rigour. It is important not to exaggerate the extent to which data and ‘rigorous assessment’ can illuminate strategic choices. Ambiguity is a fact of life, and scepticism of analysis is necessary. Accordingly, the intuition and judgement of decision-makers will always be vital to strategy, and attempting to subordinate those factors to some formulaic, deterministic decision-making model would be both undesirable and unrealistic. All the same, there is danger in the opposite extreme as well. Without careful analysis of what is relatively likely and what is relatively unlikely, what will be the possible bases for strategic choices? A decision-maker with no faith in prediction is left with little more than a set of worst-case scenarios and his existing beliefs about the world to confront the choices before him. Those beliefs may be more or less well founded, but if they are not made explicit and subject to analysis and debate regarding their application to particular strategic contexts, they remain only beliefs and premises, rather than rational judgements. Even at their best, such decisions are likely to be poorly understood by the organisations charged with their implementation. At their worst, such decisions may be poorly understood by the decision-makers themselves.

Positivism Good

Policy analysis based on facts and objective evaluation of data avoids a slide into violent and undemocratic politics – the postpositivist alternative is information suppression and hierarchy

Laurence Linn, Sid Richardson Research Professor in the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas-Austin, “A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice,” Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 18:3, 1999

In contrast, traditional policy analysts would view the consequences very differently. Send policy analysts to the collective farm and, in an inevitably interest- dominated, hierarchical political world, nontransparent methods would again go unchallenged and become even more pervasive. Secrecy, obscurantism, corruption, deception, distortion, unfounded assertion, dishonesty, narrow ambition, ideological excess, and all the other temptations to which flesh is heir might well be even more widely and securely practiced. The postpositivist dream of "unimpeded discourse" could easily become a nightmare of discourse impeded not by policy analysts claiming expertise but by a host of other antidemocratic elements inimical to informed discussion and empowered citizens. Careful attention must be paid to thedesign of institutions that promote cooperation at various levels of social discourse [Ostrom, 1998], but this is a positivist project that postpositivists could scarcely be expected to endorse. Policy analysts have a deeper worry about postpositivism. Notwithstanding her own positivist-tinged acknowledgment that "better arguments" should prevail, Danziger approvingly cites Stanley Fish as conceding that postpositivist convictions are "unsupported by absolute standards external to themselves" [Danziger, 1995, p. 448]. That this is true should not undermine the postpositivist's defense of those convictions, however. In Fish's words "the rhetorical and constructed nature of things does not compromise their reality but constitutes it, constitutes it in a form that is as invulnerable to challenge as it is unavailable to verification" [Fish, 1989, pp. 552-553]. If having convictions that are invulnerable to challenge and unavailable to verification is a virtue, then, it seems to me, postpositivists are urging us to reenter a dark, pre-enlightenment age dominated by the clash of metaphysical absolutes in which issues are settled by essentialist assertions, power and maneuver, and deliberate distortion or outright suppression of issues and opposition. It will be a politics of absolutist claims, bad numbers, and worse arguments; of emotion and unreason; of the survival of the most determined with the most to gain. Conservatives who set about dismantling the data-collection capacity of executive agencies in order to rob liberal policy analysis of its life's blood, who are acting on what they believe to be a normative and critical analysis of social dysfunction (e.g., a retreat from God), and who advocate deliberation among citizens that is uncorrupted by the kind of social science research too readily available in The Green Book, would seem to be exempt from most postpositivist criticism. Presumably, if, following rules of discourse and choice agreed to by all, a community wishes to misinvest public resources, silence politically incorrect or divisive voices, and allow self-appointed local elites to pursue their ambitions without restraint, then their wisdom neither should be criticized nor contested by postpositivists. Indeed, as far as I can tell, there are no valid grounds for doing so. Grassroots intimidation and prejudice expressed through shouting in ordinary language are, at least, authentic. Who Is Telling the Truth? If it is to be persuasive and influential, a critique of policy analysis must be based on a history that "hears" the voices of its teachers and practitioners and that observes closely the contexts and products of practice. As Dryzek and Leonard put it, "What remains ... is histories that would sort out the lessons of the past in a way that future practitioners-and publics-might find useful" [1988, p. 1258]. If such an engagement leads to a counternarrative, voices that speak in persuasive rebuttal to the voices representing policy analysis as taught and practiced, then professional practice might be induced to move more courageously in new directions. By this standard, the postpositivist derogation is a failure. The postpositive caricature of policy analysis is chilling, but false; it is so strained, so far removed from the ethos of policy analysis as generally taught and practiced, that most practitioners are justified in paying little or no attention to what they regard as esoteric, pedantic irrelevance. Moreover, the postpositivist penchant for constructing, as Edmund Wilson might put it, "imaginary systems [that are] as antithetical to the real one as possible" and for using these imaginary systems as a normative template for practice is so obviously subservient to a political agenda as to void its claim to authoas an undistorted epistemological critique of actual practice. THE CENTER WILL HOLD Policy analysis as a professional practice has been and must continue to be ethically committed to (1) improving public policy through "bringing to the table" an informed voice undistorted by a material interest in policy outcomes and (2) public policy discourse, both internal and external to agencies, that is conducted with intellectual integrity and a respect for democratic institutions. Policy analysts are obligated to recognize and adapt to changes in the environments and contexts of their practice, to acknowledge well-founded criticisms of their methods and professional conduct, and to being realistic concerning both the advantages and limitations of the tools at their disposal. Policy analysis is and will remain pragmatic and crafty. For this reason policy analysis practice will continue to be driven by problems as they arise in context. Admittedly, these contexts are more often than not hierarchical, often polarized, and always interest-driven rather than the kind of idealized contexts envisioned by postpositivists. But public policymaking is far less "federal" and hierarchical than it used to be, and decades of right-of-center politics have shifted interest decisively from public programs to incentives, choice, and quasi-markets. The exigencies of the political world will continue to insure a reality check on practice, and practice will evolve accordingly.

Realism Good

States will always act to preserve security

John Mearsheimer, R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of political science at the University of Chicago and co-director of the Program on International Security Policy, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, 2001, p. 30-32

The first assumption is that the international system is anarchic, which does not mean that it is chaotic or riven by disorder. It is easy to draw that conclusion, since realism depicts a world characterized by security competition and war. By itself, however, the realist notion of anarchy has nothing to do with conflict; it is an ordering principle, which says that the system comprises independent states that have no central authority above them.4 Sovereignty, in other words, inheres in states because there is no higher ruling body in the international system.5 There is no “government over governments.”6 The second assumption is that great powers inherently possess some offensive military capability, which gives them the wherewithal to hurt and possibly destroy each other. States are potentially dangerous to each other, although some states have more military might than others and are therefore more dangerous. A state’s military power is usually identified with the particular weaponry at its disposal, although even if there were no weapons, the individuals in those states could still use their feet and hands to attack the population of another state. After all, for every neck, there are two hands to choke it. The third assumption is that states can never be certain about other states’ intentions. Specifically, no state can be sure that another state will not use its offensive military capability to attack the first state. This is not to say that states necessarily have hostile intentions. Indeed, all of the states in the system may be reliably benign, but it is impossible to be sure of that judgment because intentions are impossible to divine with 100 percent certainty.7 There are many possible causes of aggression, and no state can be sure that another state is not motivated by one of them.8 Furthermore, intentions can change quickly, so a state’s intentions can be benign one day and hostile the next. Uncertainty about intentions is unavoidable, which means that states can never be sure that other states do not have offensive intentions to go along with their offensive capabilities. The fourth assumption is that survival is the primary goal of great powers. Specifically, states seek to maintain their territorial integrity and the autonomy of their domestic political order. Survival dominates other motives because, once a state is conquered, it is unlikely to be in a position to pursue other aims. Soviet leader Josef Stalin put the point well during a war scare in 1927: “We can and must build socialism in the [Soviet Union]. But in order to do so we first of all have to exist.”9 States can and do pursue other goals, of course, but security is their most important objective. The fifth assumption is that great powers are rational actors. They are aware of their external environment and they think strategically about how to survive in it. In particular, they consider the preferences of other states and how their own behavior is likely to affect the behavior of those other states, and how the behavior of those other states is likely to affect their own strategy for survival. Moreover, states pay attention to the long term as well as the immediate consequences of their actions. As emphasized, none of these assumptions alone dictates that great powers as a general rule *should* behave aggressively toward each other. There is surely the possibility that some state might have hostile intentions, but the only assumption dealing with a specific motive that is common to all states says that their principal objective is to survive, which by itself is a rather harmless goal. Nevertheless, when the five assumptions are married together, they create powerful incentives for great powers to think and act offensively with regard to each other. In particular, three general patterns of behavior result: fear, self-help, and power maximization.

Political units will always be concerned for their own security

Barry Buzan, Montague Burton Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and honorary professor at the University of Copenhagen, “Security, the State, the “New World Order,” and Beyond,” On Security, ed. Ronnie D. Lipschutz, 1998, CIAO

One assumption underlying this chapter is that differences in internal construction have a substantial impact on how states define threats and vulnerabilities, and therefore on the whole construction of the security problematique. Given their fundamental character, all states (or at least all of those that are embedded in an international system--and it is only these that will be discussed here) will share bottom line security concerns about the maintenance of their territorial base and their political autonomy. If the threat is of external armed attack aimed at seizing territory or resources, or overthrowing the government, then, within the limits of resources, conceptions of security will tend to be similar in all states, and the effect of internal differences will be pushed into the background. Beyond that bottom line, however, internal differences can have radical effects on the construction of security, affecting both the breadth of the security agenda (what kinds of actions--military, political, economic, societal, environmental--are perceived as threats), and the definition of priorities for security policy.

Consequentialism Good

Consequentialism is key – their absolutism destroys political responsibility

Jeffrey Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University-Bloomington, Dissent, Vol. 49 No. 2, Spring 2002

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness. WHAT WOULD IT mean for the American left right now to take seriously the centrality of means in politics? First, it would mean taking seriously the specific means employed by the September 11 attackers--terrorism. There is a tendency in some quarters of the left to assimilate the death and destruction of September 11 to more ordinary (and still deplorable) injustices of the world system--the starvation of children in Africa, or the repression of peasants in Mexico, or the continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. But this assimilation is only possible by ignoring the specific modalities of September 11. It is true that in Mexico, Palestine, and elsewhere, too many innocent people suffer, and that is wrong. It may even be true that the experience of suffering is equally terrible in each case. But neither the Mexican nor the Israeli government has ever hijacked civilian airliners and deliberately flown them into crowded office buildings in the middle of cities where innocent civilians work and live, with the intention of killing thousands of people. Al-Qaeda did precisely this. That does not make the other injustices unimportant. It simply makes them different. It makes the September 11 hijackings distinctive, in their defining and malevolent purpose--to kill people and to create terror and havoc. This was not an ordinary injustice. It was an extraordinary injustice. The premise of terrorism is the sheer superfluousness of human life. This premise is inconsistent with civilized living anywhere. It threatens people of every race and class, every ethnicity and religion. Because it threatens everyone, and threatens values central to any decent conception of a good society, it must be fought. And it must be fought in a way commensurate with its malevolence. Ordinary injustice can be remedied. Terrorism can only be stopped. Second, it would mean frankly acknowledging something well understood, often too eagerly embraced, by the twentieth century Marxist left--that it is often politically necessary to employ morally troubling means in the name of morally valid ends. A just or even a better society can only be realized in and through political practice; in our complex and bloody world, it will sometimes be necessary to respond to barbarous tyrants or criminals, with whom moral suasion won't work. In such situations our choice is not between the wrong that confronts us and our ideal vision of a world beyond wrong. It is between the wrong that confronts us and the means--perhaps the dangerous means--we have to employ in order to oppose it. In such situations there is a danger that "realism" can become a rationale for the Machiavellian worship of power. But equally great is the danger of a righteousness that translates, in effect, into a refusal to act in the face of wrong. What is one to do? Proceed with caution. Avoid casting oneself as the incarnation of pure goodness locked in a Manichean struggle with evil. Be wary of violence. Look for alternative means when they are available, and support the development of such means when they are not. And never sacrifice democratic freedoms and open debate. Above all, ask the hard questions about the situation at hand, the means available, and the likely effectiveness of different strategies. Most striking about the campus left's response to September 11 was its refusal to ask these questions. Its appeals to "international law" were naive. It exaggerated the likely negative consequences of a military response, but failed to consider the consequences of failing to act decisively against terrorism. In the best of all imaginable worlds, it might be possible to defeat al-Qaeda without using force and without dealing with corrupt regimes and political forces like the Northern Alliance. But in this world it is not possible. And this, alas, is the only world that exists. To be politically responsible is to engage this world and to consider the choices that it presents. To refuse to do this is to evade responsibility. Such a stance may indicate a sincere refusal of unsavory choices. But it should never be mistaken for a serious political commitment.

Cede the Political Bad

Disengagement from the political sphere cedes control to the far right – this causes violence, oppression, and straight turns the K

Richard Rorty, professor emeritus of comparative literature and philosophy at Stanford University, “Achieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth-Century America, 1998, pp. 89-94

Many writers on socioeconomic policy have warned that the old industrialized democracies are heading into a Weimar-like period, one in which populist movements are likely to overturn constitutional governments. Edward Luttwak, for example, has suggested that fascism may be the American future. The point of his book The Endangered Ameri­can Dream is that members of labor unions, and unorganized unskilled workers, will sooner or later realize that their gov­ernment is not even trying to prevent wages from sinking or to prevent jobs from being exported. Around the same time, they will realize that suburban white-collar workers-them- selves desperately afraid of being downsized-are not going to let themselves be taxed to provide social benefits for any­one else. At that point, something will crack. The nonsuburban electorate will decide that the system has failed and start looking around for a strongman to vote for-someone willing to assure them that, once he is elected, the smug bureaucrats, tricky lawyers, overpaid bond salesmen, and postmodernist professors will no longer be calling the shots. A scenario like that of Sinclair Lewis’ novel It Can’t Happen Here may then be played out. For once such a strongman takes office, nobody can predict what will happen. In 1932, most of the predictions made about what would happen if Hindenburg named Hitler chancellor were wildly overoptimistic. One thing that is very likely to happen is that the gains made in the past forty years by black and brown Americans, and by homosexuals, will be wiped out. Jocular contempt for women will come back into fashion. The words "nigger" and "kike" will once again be heard in the workplace. All the sadism which the academic Left has tried to make unaccept­able to its students will come flooding back. All the resent­ment which badly educated Americans feel about having their manners dictated to them by college graduates will find an outlet. But such a renewal of sadism will not alter the effects of selfishness. For after my imagined strongman takes charge, he will quickly make his peace with the international super­rich, just as Hitler made his with the German industrialists. He will invoke the glorious memory of the Gulf War to pro­voke military adventures which will generate short-term prosperity. He will be a disaster for the country and the world. People will wonder why there was so little resistance to his evitable rise. Where, they will ask, was the American Left? Why was it only rightists like Buchanan who spoke to the workers about the consequences of globalization? Why could not the Left channel the mounting rage of the newly dispossessed? It is often said that we Americans, at the end of the twenti­eth century, no longer have a Left. Since nobody denies the existence of what I have called the cultural Left, this amounts to an admission that that Left is unable to engage in national politics. It is not the sort of Left which can be asked to deal with the consequences of globalization. To get the country to deal with those consequences, the present cultural Left would have to transform itself by opening relations with the residue of the old reformist Left, and in particular with the labor unions. It would have to talk much more about money, even at the cost of talking less about stigma. I have two suggestions about how to effect this transition. The first is that the Left should put a moratorium on theory. It should try to kick its philosophy habit. The second is that the Left should try to mobilize what remains of our pride in being Americans. It should ask the public to consider how the country of Lincoln and Whitman might be achieved. In support of my first suggestion, let me cite a passage from Dewey's Reconstruction in Philosophy in which he ex­presses his exasperation with the sort of sterile debate now going on under the rubric of "individualism versus commu­nitarianism." Dewey thought that all discussions which took this dichotomy seriously suffer from a common defect. They are all committed to the logic of general notions under which specific situa­tions are to be brought. What we want is light upon this or that group of individuals, this or that concrete human being, this or that special institution or social arrangement. For such a logic of inquiry, the tradition­ally accepted logic substitutes discussion of the mean­ing of concepts and their dialectical relationships with one another. Dewey was right to be exasperated by sociopolitical theory conducted at this level of abstraction. He was wrong when he went on to say that ascending to this level is typically a right­ist maneuver, one which supplies "the apparatus for intellec­tual justifications of the established order. "9 For such ascents are now more common on the Left than on the Right. The contemporary academic Left seems to think that the higher your level of abstraction, the more subversive of the estab­lished order you can be. The more sweeping and novel your conceptual apparatus, the more radical your critique. When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been "inadequately theorized," you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of lan­guage, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist ver­sion of economic determinism. Theorists of the Left think that dissolving political agents into plays of differential sub­jectivity, or political initiatives into pursuits of Lacan's im­possible object of desire, helps to subvert the established order. Such subversion, they say, is accomplished by "problematizing familiar concepts." Recent attempts to subvert social institutions by prob­lematizing concepts have produced a few very good books. They have also produced many thousands of books which represent scholastic philosophizing at its worst. The authors of these purportedly "subversive" books honestly believe that they are serving human liberty. But it is almost impossi­ble to clamber back down from their books to a level of ab­straction on which one might discuss the merits of a law, a treaty, a candidate, or a political strategy. Even though what these authors "theorize" is often something very concrete and near at hand-a current TV show, a media celebrity, a re­cent scandal-they offer the most abstract and barren expla­nations imaginable. These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into polit­ical relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left re­treats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice pro­duces theoretical hallucinations. These result in an intellec­tual environment which is, as Mark Edmundson says in his book Nightmare on Main Street, Gothic. The cultural Left is haunted by ubiquitous specters, the most frightening of which is called "power." This is the name of what Edmund­son calls Foucault's "haunting agency, which is everywhere and nowhere, as evanescent and insistent as a resourceful spook."10

Cede the Political Bad

Their critique is just cynicism – rejecting involvement with political structures discounts past positive advances and makes reshaping structures like the state impossible

Stephen Eric Bronner, Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, 2004, Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement, p. x-xii

The preoccupations of the philosophes with social and institutional re­form, and what Max Weber termed the “elective affinity” between their val­ues and progressive agents for change, now seem to receive scant attention. This is all the more unfortunate since new transnational movements have come into existence, often confused in terms of how they should respond to “globalization,” along with functioning transnational political institutions that still suffer from a deficit of loyalty. New communications technologies are providing new organizational possibilities for political resistance, ex­panding the range of available experiences, and opening the way for new un­derstandings of the most diverse cultures. New forms of solidarity, reflected in the popular concern with “human rights,” have challenged imperialist wars, outdated cultural norms, and authoritarian politics. The objective con­ditions for realizing the unrealized hopes associated with internationalism, liberal democracy, and social justice are already there; only the ideological willingness to embrace the assumptions underpinning these values is lacking. That is what provides the Enlightenment with a new salience for our time. Humanity is not in the past, but rather in the making. Conservatism may have set the agenda since the last quarter of the twentieth century. But that does not justify the resignation and increasingly debilitating pessimism as­sociated with so many current forms of “radical” thought. Genuinely pro­gressive changes have occurred: dictators have fallen and more citizens of the world have been enfranchised; battles for economic justice have been won; racism and sexism are on the defensive; and there has been poetry— good poetry—after Auschwitz. Easy to downplay the gains, suggest that they have now been “absorbed”; and embrace a new version of the old and tired attitude known as “cultural pessimism.” Cynicism always comes cheap. The real challenge lies in recognizing how the “system,” which was never as “to­tally administered” as many would like to think has been changed for the better through social action inspired by Enlightenment ideals. The closed society has become more open and—against the provincial, religious, exploitative, and authoritarian sources of opposition—it has the potential of becoming more open still. Deciding to enter the fray, however, becomes more difficult when relying on philosophical perspectives that leave their supporters wandering about lost in Hegel’s night in which all cows are black. It is necessary to distinguish between traditions not by making refer­ence to metaphysics, but rather by looking at the political and ideological conflicts between actual movements. Again, the radical democratic and egalitarian aspects of the Enlightenment have been betrayed often enough. But this recognition presupposes that there was indeed something to betray. Which promises made by the Enlightenment have been broken becomes ap­parent not from the standpoint of “negative dialectics,” communitarian convictions, “pragmatism,” or ethical relativism, but rather by taking seri­ously its universal understanding of liberty and progress.

Cap Good: Disease

Capitalism is key to solving disease - private sector development is crucial

Norberg '3

Johan Norberg, senior fellow at Cato Institute, In Defense of Global Capitalism, Cato Institute, 2003, p. 154

[One common objection to the market economy is that it causes people and enterprises to produce for profit, not for needs. This means, for example, pharmaceutical companies devoting huge resources to research and medicines to do with obesity, baldness, and depression, things that westerners can afford to worry about and pay for, whereas only a fraction is devoted to attempting to cure tropical diseases afflicting the poorest of the world's inhabitants, such as malaria and tuberculosis. This criticism is understandable. The unfairness exists, but capitalism is not to blame for it. Without capitalism and the lure of profit, we shouldn't imagine that everyone would have obtained cures for their illnesses. In fact, far fewer would do so than is now the case. If wealthy people in the West demand help for their problems, their resources can be used to research and eventually solve those problems, which are not necessarily trivial to the people afflicted with them. Capitalism gives companies economic incentives to help us by developing medicines and vaccines. That westerners spend money this way does not make things worse for anyone. This is not money that would otherwise have gone to researching tropical diseases—the pharmaceutical companies simply would not have had these resources otherwise. And, as free trade and the market economy promote greater prosperity in poorer countries, their needs and desires will play a larger role in dictating the purposes of research and production. It is not a problem for the Third World that more and more diseases have been made curable in the Western world. On the contrary, that is something that has proved to be a benefit, and not just because a wealthier world can devote more resources to helping the poor. In many fields, the Third World can inexpen¬sively share in the research financed by wealthy Western custom¬ers, sometimes paying nothing for it. The Merck Corporation gave free medicine to a project to combat onchocerciasis (river blindness) in 11 African states. As a result those states have now rid themselves almost completely of a parasite that formerly affected something like a million people, blinding thousands every year.22 The Monsanto Corporation allows researchers and companies free use of their technique for developing "golden rice," a strain of rice enriched with iron and beta carotene (pro-vitamin A), which could save a million people annually in the Third World who are dying of vitamin A deficiency diseases. A number of pharmaceutical companies are lowering the prices of inhibitors for HIV/AIDS in poor countries by up to 95 percent, on condition that the patents are preserved so that they can maintain full prices in wealthier countries. ]

The impact is extinction

Ryan 97

Frank Ryan, M.D. Virus X, 1997, p. 366

How might the human race appear to such an aggressively emerging virus? That teeming, globally intrusive species, with its transcontinental air travel, massively congested cities, sexual promiscuity, and in the less affluent regions — where the virus is most likely to first emerge — a vulnerable lack of hygiene with regard to food and water supplies and hospitality to biting insects' The virus is best seen, in John Hollands excellent analogy, as a swarm of competing mutations, with each individual strain subjected to furious forces of natural selection for the strain, or strains, most likely to amplify and evolve in the new ecological habitat.3 With such a promising new opportunity in the invaded species, natural selection must eventually come to dominate viral behavior. In time the dynamics of infection will select for a more resistant human population. Such a coevolution takes rather longer in "human" time — too long, given the ease of spread within the global village. A rapidly lethal and quickly spreading virus simply would not have time to switch from aggression to coevolution. And there lies the danger. Joshua Lederbergs prediction can now be seen to be an altogether logical one. Pandemics are inevitable. Our incredibly rapid human evolution, our overwhelming global needs, the advances of our complex industrial society, all have moved the natural goalposts. The advance of society, the very science of change, has greatly augmented the potential for the emergence of a pandemic strain. It is hardly surprising that Avrion Mitchison, scientific director of Deutsches Rheuma Forschungszentrum in Berlin, asks the question: "Will we survive!” We have invaded every biome on earth and we continue to destroy other species so very rapidly that one eminent scientist foresees the day when no life exists on earth apart from the human monoculture and the small volume of species useful to it. An increasing multitude of disturbed viral-host symbiotic cycles are provoked into self-protective counterattacks. This is a dangerous situation. And we have seen in the previous chapter how ill-prepared the world is to cope with it. It begs the most frightening question of all: could such a pandemic virus cause the extinction of the human species?

Cap Good: Freedom

Greed and wealth are inevitable - capitalism provides value to live by channeling this greed to benefiting society as a whole - the alternative is coercion and slavery - gender modified

Nash '2

Dr. Ronald H. Nash, Professor of Philosophy at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, "Government is too big and why it's costing you!" Summit Ministries, 2002, accessed 11/17/09 http://www.summit.org/resources/essays/2008/02/government\_is\_too\_big\_and\_its.php

Among all of our economic options, Arthur Shenfield writes, only capitalism "operates on the basis of respect for free, independent, responsible persons. All other systems in varying degrees treat [people] men as less than this. Socialist systems above all treat [people] men as pawns to be moved about by the authorities, or as children to be given what the rulers decide is good for them, or as serfs or slaves. The rulers begin by boasting about their compassion, which in any case is fraudulent, but after a time they drop this pretense, which they find unnecessary for the maintenance of power. In all things they act on the presumption that they know best. Therefore they and their systems are morally stunted. Only the free system, the much assailed capitalism, is morally mature." [41] The alternative to free exchange is coercion and violence. Capitalism allows natural human desires to be satisfied in a non-violent way. Little can be done to prevent human beings from wanting to be rich, Shenfield says. That's the way things often are in a fallen world. But capitalism, through the natural desire of man to succeed, channels that drive into peaceful means that benefit many, not just those who wish to improve their own situation or status in life. "The alternative to serving other men's wants," Shenfield concludes, "is seizing power of them, as it always has been. Hence it is not surprising that wherever the enemies of capitalism have prevailed, the result has been not only the debasement of consumption standards for the masses but also their reduction to serfdom by the new privileged class of Socialist rulers." [42]